

ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

700 mdy

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

THIRTEEN

No. 506

OCTOBER, 1930

**77* Vol. 255

I. Insurance or the Dole.

By Lieut.-Col. Cuthbert Headlam, D.S.O.

II. Christopher Marlowe, the Man. By C. E. Lawrence

III. The Music of Life. By R. W. S. Mendl

IV. The Report of the Indian Statutory Commission
and Its Critics.

By the Hon. Edward Cadogan, C.B., M.P.

V. The Jesuits. By Sidney Dark

VI. The Call to Efficiency. By D. B. Lloyd

VII. The Stage: Yesterday, To-day and To-morrow.

By Joe Graham

VIII. The Soviet Union and Peace. By Geoffrey Popham.

IX. A Painter of Ferrara. By Edward McCurdy

X. "Malbrook." By James Wilson

XI. The Evolution of Sex.

By Professor Sir Arthur Thomson, LL.D.

Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by the

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

(ROBERT J. SPENCE, PROP.)

249 WEST THIRTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK.

Single Copies \$1.75

Yearly Subscription \$6.00

Canada Subscription \$5.00 per year; Single Copies \$1.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

Select Educational Institutions

GIRLS' SCHOOLS

College of St. Elizabeth

Convent Station, New Jersey

45 Minutes from New York

Catholic College for Women

Registered by Regents

Standard College Preparatory Courses

Academy of St. Elizabeth

Send for Catalogue

Saint Mary's School Mount Saint Gabriel

PEEKSKILL-ON-THE-HUDSON, N. Y.

Boarding School for Girls

Under the charge of the Sisters of St. Mary
New fireproof building beautifully situated

For catalogues address *The Sister Superior*

CHEVY CHASE SCHOOL

Residential Junior College and Senior High
School for girls. Twelve-acre campus. Advan-
tages of National Capital. Address CHEVY
CHASE SCHOOL, Box N.

FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON, Ph. D.,

President

Washington, D. C.

HARCOTT PLACE SCHOOL GAMBIER, OHIO

A Church School for Girls
College Preparatory and General Courses,
Music, Art, Supervised Athletics,

Lower School

Sarah Bedell Macdonald, A.B., Headmistress

Marion Eloise Lasher, Associate Headmistress

REFERENCES

Rt. Rev. William Andrew Leonard, D.D.

Rt. Rev. Warren Lincoln Rogers, D.D.

Mrs. William G. Mather, President Board of Trustees

BOYS' SCHOOLS

SEVERN SCHOOL

A country boarding school for boys. Ideal loca-
tion on Severn River near Annapolis. Prepares for
College, West Point and Annapolis. Exceptionally
thorough work given and demanded. Students taught
to study. Water sports and all athletics. Limited
city. Catalogue.

WILLIAM M. TEEL, Ph. B., Principal,
Boone, Md.

THE ORATORY SCHOOL

College preparatory school for the sons of
gentlemen.

Conducted by the Oratorian Fathers.

Classes taught by competent laymen.

Preference given to applicants to Lower School

Apply to Headmaster,

Summit, New Jersey

LEARN LANGUAGES

Private and Class instruction in all modern
languages. English included. Skilled native teachers.
Reasonable tuition. Day and Evening Classes.
Enroll at a BERLITZ SCHOOL in New
York, Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Wash-
ington, Detroit, Chicago, etc.

HOME STUDY COURSE

for out of town students. Write for particulars
New York Berlitz School, 39 West 34th Street.

This Space Available

COLLEGES

University of Southern California

Comprises the following schools and colleges: Law,
Art, Law, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Music, Speech,
Commerce and Business Administration, Religion,
Social Welfare, Education, Graduate School, Metropoli-
tan College.

President, Rufus B. von Klein Smid, A.M.,
J.D., D.M.G.P., Ph. et Litt.D.

For bulletins, address Registrar, University of
Southern California, Los Angeles.

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Fully accredited Senior College for men

Boarding and day school

Distinct High School and Grammar Departments

Write for catalog

IDEALLY SITUATED IN THE

WINTER PLAYGROUND OF AMERICA

Brenau College Conservatory

Select patronage 32 states; location, foothills
Ridge Mts. North of Atlanta. Standard A. B. of
special advantages in music, oratory, art, doc-
trine, science, physical culture. 32 buildings. Outdoor
swimming, boating, horseback riding, etc.

Catalog and illustrated book. Address:

BRENAU, Box E, Gainesville, Ga.

When answering advertisements

kindly mention the

Leonard Scott Publications

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 506.—OCTOBER, 1930.

Art. 1.—INSURANCE OR THE DOLE.

RECENT debates in Parliament have shown that the System of Unemployment Insurance, as administered in this country, has completely broken down. Not only has it been found necessary to increase the borrowing powers of the Insurance Fund to 60,000,000*l.*, but the Government, recognising the fact that the Fund cannot be expected indefinitely to bear the cost of supporting large numbers of unemployed persons for whom no corresponding contributions have been made, has been obliged to transfer to the E. hequer the charge for benefit drawn under the transitional provisions of the Scheme. It is obvious, therefore, that the Fund is to all intents and purposes bankrupt, and that a non-contributory form of public assistance has been grafted on to the original Contributory Insurance Scheme. It is equally obvious that some drastic alterations will have to be made in the administrative machinery of the Scheme if the system of unemployment benefit is again to be placed on a sound basis and is not to degenerate into a gigantic system of State maintenance with its attendant evils. The fact that a Committee representing the three political parties is now studying the Insurance question is proof that there is a general agreement that the existing state of things must not be allowed to continue; but there can be no satisfactory solution of the problem unless a real attempt is made to analyse the causes of unemployment and to provide for a separate treatment of different categories of unemployed persons.

When the Insurance Scheme was first established, no one foresaw the length and severity of the trade
Vol. 255.—No. 506.

depression which was to follow the short post-War boom, and unemployment benefit was intended for a state of affairs in which an efficient workman might expect to find his regular occupation interrupted by short, occasional periods of unemployment. At that time unemployment in the insured trades averaged only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and it was estimated that before the War the average unemployment over a period of years covering the ordinary length of a trade cycle was about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In such circumstances the rule that six contributions must be made for each payment of benefit and that not more than twenty-six weeks' benefit might be drawn in a single year could not be considered unduly harsh. But during the ten years of industrial depression which have followed the inauguration of the Scheme the number of the unemployed has been so large and their periods of unemployment of such long duration, that it has been found impossible to carry the whole body of those who have been thrown out of work on the fixed contribution basis as originally laid down.

At first it was thought that this abnormal unemployment would not last long and that only temporary relaxations would be necessary. A system of 'extended benefits' was accordingly introduced under which payments could be continued at the discretion of the Minister of Labour to insured persons even if their right to 'standard' or 'covenanted' benefit had been exhausted. The only contribution test demanded was that an applicant should be able to show eight stamps affixed in the last two years, or thirty at any time. These grants of extended benefit were looked upon by the insurance authorities as advances on future contributions, but in areas where there was acute depression they were often continued indefinitely without any return being made to the Fund.

This arrangement was admittedly unsatisfactory, and in 1925 the Blanesburgh Committee was appointed to review the whole question of Unemployment Insurance. Although the signs of the times were far from propitious, this Committee took an optimistic view of the situation, and based its recommendations on the theory that a true insurance scheme should provide benefits for all 'insured persons who are genuinely unemployed.' As a fixed ratio between contributions and benefit would

obviously exclude many genuinely unemployed workers in times of unusual depression, the Committee recommended that the distinction between standard and extended benefit should be abolished, and that a more lenient contribution test than the 'one in six' rule should be applied for all payments of benefit. The Committee, while making this recommendation, was, however, fully aware that all the virtues of an insurance system would be lost unless it were financially independent and 'so designed as to convince everybody that the contributions to it really provide the benefits which it offers.' It recommended, therefore, as a convenient compromise, that benefit should be paid to all applicants who as well as fulfilling the other conditions could show that they had paid thirty contributions to the Fund within the last two years.

In practice the system inaugurated by the Act of 1927 as a result of the Blanesburgh Committee's report broke down, just as that of 1920 had broken down, because the amount of unemployment had been vastly underestimated. In January 1921, 11 per cent. of the insured workers were unemployed, in January 1922, 17 per cent., in January 1928, 10·7 per cent., in August 1930, 17·5 per cent., while from 1920 to 1930 the average has been about 12 per cent. Even under the thirty contributions rule, large numbers of genuinely unemployed persons would have been disqualified, but this rule has in fact never been enforced. According to the emergency or 'transitional conditions' which have been continuously in operation since 1927, the contribution test is the same as that previously imposed for extended benefit—eight contributions in the last two years, or thirty at any time. This means that a man, who during the whole of the last ten years has altogether worked for seven months in insurable employment, can continue to draw benefit indefinitely without making any return.

As soon as the fixed contribution rule was abolished it obviously became necessary, in order to prevent the Insurance System from becoming a mere dole or out-of-work donation, to impose stricter conditions whereby the genuineness of every individual claim could be tested. Until the passing of the 1930 Act by the present Government, the condition that a claimant must be

'genuinely seeking work but unable to obtain suitable employment' was looked upon as the main safeguard against abuse. Its interpretation and application involved some administrative difficulties, and caused a certain amount of discontent, especially in districts where employment was hard to find; but, in spite of these defects, the Blanesburgh Committee recommended its retention because, according to its view, the right to receive benefit should depend not so much upon the number of contributions an applicant had made as upon the fact that his own persistent efforts to find work were rendered fruitless by economic causes over which he had no control. Whether this view is right or wrong must be a matter of opinion, but there can be little doubt that the simplest and most satisfactory test of a man's desire for work is his acceptance or refusal of a definite offer of employment. Under existing conditions, however, such a test is not always possible, for only about 5 per cent. of the vacancies in the insured industries are filled by the labour exchanges, and, unless the notification of all vacancies were to be made compulsory, this percentage is not likely to be increased. Such a step would almost certainly be opposed both by employers of labour, who fear that it might restrict their freedom of choice, and by the Trade Unions, which are determined to maintain the efficiency of their own placing arrangements.

There is a consensus of well-founded opinion that the first necessity of any satisfactory reform is that the Unemployment Insurance Fund should be restored to its original position as an independent trust fund administered by the State for the benefit of its contributors. This can only be done by a return to some kind of fixed contribution rule and by the maintenance of a definite proportion between the number of contributions paid in and the number of benefits paid out. It is not intended here to lay down definite rules on the subject, but it is suggested that from the insurance point of view the 'thirty contributions rule' is not satisfactory, since it does not emphasise sufficiently the connection between the contributions made by an individual and the benefits that he receives, and is financially unsound: at the present time the debt of the Fund to the Exchequer is increasing at the rate of £25,000,000 a year, although the Exchequer

has actually taken over the whole cost of supporting those who do not qualify for benefit under the 'thirty contributions rule.' It does not follow that a return to the 'one in six' rule would be the only alternative. A ratio would have to be established actuarially, according to which, after taking into account the total amount of the contributions, the maximum amount possible could be drawn in return for each individual contribution. It would probably be found advisable not to impose any fixed maximum for the number of benefits that could be drawn in a single year in order to safeguard the interest of men who, after having been in regular employment and having thus accumulated a large reserve of contributions, become unemployed for long periods as a result of trade depression or other unavoidable causes.

The rate of benefit in existing circumstances should not be substantially less than that now in force, as the object of the Insurance System is to make the insured person independent of any form of public assistance; but the ultimate aim of Parliament, when once the Scheme has been restored to a sound financial basis, must be to relieve the burden on industry which it entails by some reduction in the rates of contribution paid both by the employer and by the employee. It follows that, if the Unemployment Insurance Fund were strictly administered for the benefit only of genuinely insured persons, a considerable proportion of those now in receipt of benefit would be excluded in the future. For these in the present state of our civilisation, some provision other than that laid down by the old Poor Law will have to be made, but it must be entirely distinct from the Insurance System.

It has been estimated that, on the present basis of contributions and benefits, a reformed Insurance Scheme would be able to carry rather over a million unemployed. In a period of trade depression, such as has been experienced since 1921, this would leave a number of unemployed persons varying from about one hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand for whom provision would have to be made by subsidiary schemes. The establishment of such subsidiary schemes is no easy matter, since it involves a complete overhauling of the existing machinery of social services and public assistance. Hitherto such

attempts as have been made to revise the Insurance System have failed largely because such revision has been undertaken without sufficient reference to other forms of social assistance. But, if the Insurance System is to be maintained, as it should be, on a contributory basis, it must be frankly recognised that those who have exhausted their right to benefit can no longer be treated as if they were insured persons. To sacrifice the Contributory Insurance System would be to accept the Socialist theory that it is the duty of the State to provide maintenance for all unemployed persons and to treat them all in the same way—a theory that in practice would lead to the gradual pauperisation of the working classes. The Insurance System, on the other hand, is based on the correct principle that the working man must face the risk of temporary unemployment and must be encouraged, therefore, in prosperous times to make provision for his time of need.

No sound scheme for the reform of the Insurance System can be effected except in conjunction with some reform of the existing Poor Law. As things are to-day, the enforcement of more stringent conditions for the payment of insurance benefit would inevitably result in an increase in the demands made upon the local assistance authorities. The only way by which this could be prevented would be to supplement the Insurance System by the payment of State out-of-work donations, equal in amount to insurance benefit, to all insured workers who had exhausted their contributions. Obviously such a policy is not worthy of serious consideration—it would retain the worst evils of the Dole, would undermine the contributory principle on which the Insurance System is based, and would serve to pauperise a large section of the community at the expense of the taxpayer.

Moreover, it is essential, in order to keep the total cost as low as possible, that a part at least of the administration of expenditure for the support of unemployed persons who have exhausted their right to benefit should be entrusted to an authority which is in a position to take into account the actual needs of each particular claimant, and is not compelled to choose between a fixed rate of payment and no payment at all. It will be necessary, therefore, to establish by law certain definite conditions

in accordance with which outdoor relief may be given by the local authorities to the able-bodied unemployed. For this purpose the powers and functions of the local authorities will have to be overhauled and revised. Recent reforms in local government have provided an improved machinery of Poor Law administration, and the substitution of larger areas for the old Poor Law Unions may lead to greater uniformity of practice and economy of administration throughout the country; it is also now legal to give outdoor relief in cases of destitution among able-bodied unemployed persons; but so far, no serious attempt has been made to regulate the part that the public assistance authorities should play in the relief of the unemployed, or to define the respective duties of such authorities and of the labour exchanges.

As a matter of fact, the traditional principle of the English Poor Law, that no outdoor relief should be given to the able-bodied poor, has invariably broken down in times of acute industrial depression, and since 1921 it has been practically abandoned in many districts. The result has been serious confusion and overlapping between the local relief authorities and the labour exchanges, and, owing to the fact that no general rule for the granting of outdoor relief and no maximum scale of payments has been laid down by the Ministry of Health, there has been great divergence of practice between different parts of the country. Some authorities have adhered to the strict principle of giving no outdoor relief to able-bodied persons; others have given relief to the able-bodied unemployed only when they were not actually in receipt of insurance benefit; and others have established a scale of relief higher than the current rate of insurance benefit.

In their evidence before the Blanesburgh Committee the representatives of the Poor Law Guardians in England and of the Parish Councils in Scotland were unanimous in their opinion that the Insurance Scheme should be made self-supporting, that no uncovenanted benefit should be paid, and that all insured workers who had exhausted their contributions should be dealt with by the public assistance authorities, provided that some system of State grants in aid of rates were devised in order to enable the local authorities to bear this additional

burden. The Blanesburgh Committee did not accept this point of view on the grounds that :

‘ It would be unfortunate if a state of things were created under which any one whom the authorities of the Insurance Scheme declined to pay were paid at once by the guardians. In that case the administration of unemployment insurance would be seriously compromised, since if any one to whom the authorities of the Insurance Scheme properly refused benefit could be at once relieved by the local guardians partly out of moneys provided by the State, the refusal would be a matter of indifference to the claimant.’

This criticism is valid enough in theory, but in practice it has been found quite impossible to prevent the procedure condemned by the Blanesburgh Committee. The number of insured persons in receipt of poor relief on account of themselves or their dependants is still considerable, and in most areas where there is any serious degree of unemployment it has been quite usual for those who have been refused insurance benefit to turn for help to the guardians. The two authorities overlap not only in the giving of assistance, but in their other functions, the training of, and the finding work for, the unemployed. The labour exchanges, which were created for the purpose and have the proper machinery, should obviously be responsible for the placing and training of unemployed persons throughout the country. Nevertheless, during recent years many of the more enterprising boards of guardians have been carrying on the same work on a smaller scale, and some local authorities have gone as far as to appoint special officers whose duty it is to assist unemployed persons on relief to find work.

The following proposals are based on a recognition of the fact that in practice it is impossible to hand over the care of the able-bodied unemployed entirely to the labour exchanges and to leave to the Poor Law authorities only the aged, the sick and the unemployable poor. The difficulties that have made it impossible to separate those in need of assistance into two fixed categories, entrusting one to the Ministry of Labour and the other to the local relief authorities controlled by the Ministry of Health, are in fact insuperable. The two authorities look at the question of unemployment from two different angles, but each performs a necessary function. The

labour exchanges, in granting or refusing benefit, consider whether or not the applicant is genuinely unemployed and genuinely available and anxious for work. The local Poor Law authorities, in granting or refusing relief, consider whether or not the applicant is genuinely in need of assistance. In the process of carrying out their respective duties the two authorities have each devised their own machinery; the one to inquire into the industrial history of the applicant, the other to inquire into his domestic circumstances. Now, it is clear that no satisfactory solution of the unemployment problem can be found which does not take into account both aspects of the question, and which does not make use of both forms of investigation.

It has sometimes been urged that the whole administration of unemployment insurance benefit, and of the social services and of all forms of public assistance, should be under the control of one Government Department, but such a drastic change is not at the present time within the sphere of practical politics. Nor is it by any means certain that it would prove successful. The Ministry of Labour, whose primary function is to secure the industrial efficiency of the nation, is called upon to find work for the unemployed and to promote in every way the mobility of labour; it must, therefore, consider the needs of industry from a national point of view. The Ministry of Health, on the other hand, whose primary function is to look after the health and well-being of the people, must consider the particular circumstances of every district and must, if its services are to be adequately and not extravagantly administered, make full use of local knowledge and experience. The work of the one department is necessarily highly centralised, while that of the other is largely carried out through the agency of the local authorities. The care of the unemployed naturally falls within the sphere of both departments, and the endeavour should be to define more clearly their respective duties and to effect a closer co-operation between them.

The finding of work for the unemployed should be the special function of the labour exchanges, and local authorities should not be encouraged or assisted to set up rival organisations for a similar purpose. The Ministry of Health, however, should insist that no outdoor relief

be given to any able-bodied unemployed person unless he is registered at some labour exchange. A refusal to accept employment or loss of employment through misconduct should definitely disqualify an applicant for outdoor relief, and the Ministry of Health should make it clear to local authorities that as regards the enforcement of the rules as to such disqualifications they must be guided entirely by the investigations and the decisions made by the labour exchanges. On the other hand, any discretionary power that may be necessary regarding the amount of assistance to be given in any particular case should rest with the local authorities, in view of the fact that this must depend upon a close examination into the domestic circumstances of the applicant, and must take into account the total amount of the family income.

Although a large number of unemployed persons will necessarily come under the ægis of both departments, it does not follow that they should not be divided into categories under which they would primarily be entrusted to the care either of the Ministry of Labour or of the Ministry of Health. The able-bodied worker who is temporarily unemployed but still in receipt of insurance benefit naturally belongs to the Ministry of Labour; he receives his benefit as a right, whether or not he has other sources of income, and no inquiry need be made into his private circumstances. Unemployed persons who have exhausted their right to benefit, and who suffer from no special disability arising from age or infirmity, should also be kept under the direct control of the labour exchanges, since the essential condition for the receipt of benefit must be that they fulfil the tests imposed by the Ministry of Labour and can prove that they are genuinely anxious for work but unable to obtain it. Moreover, nothing must be done to anchor such persons in the particular localities in which they have become unemployed. It is essential, however, in the interests of economy and in order to emphasise the distinction between insurance benefit and any form of public assistance, that the amount paid to the uncovenanted unemployed by the labour exchanges should be less than the current rate of insurance benefit. Any individual in this category who found it impossible to live on the amount granted in this way would have to apply for extra relief to the local authori-

ties and would, therefore, come under the cognisance of both departments.

When dealing with unemployed persons who have exhausted their right to insurance benefit a distinction might well be drawn between those who are likely to regain employment, and those who for all practical purposes have fallen permanently outside the sphere of the Insurance System. Age undoubtedly plays a very important part in determining the question of re-employment. It is, therefore, suggested that insured contributors who have exhausted their right to benefit should be divided into two categories—those under and those over fifty years of age.

1. *Provision for those under fifty years of age.* This category of persons should not be a charge on the local assistance authorities, but should be paid a 'welfare allowance' out of State funds considerably less in amount than the current rate of unemployment benefit. It has sometimes been suggested that persons excluded under a reformed Insurance System should be handed over to the local authorities, and that grants should be made by the Exchequer to defray the cost of their relief. Such a policy of giving State grants on a large scale would serve to undermine the sense of responsibility of the local authorities and should be avoided, therefore, as far as possible.

It is essential also, that the workers in this category, although for a time they have exhausted their right to benefit, should be kept within the purview of the labour exchanges and under the direct control of the Ministry of Labour. Any grant, therefore, which may be given to them should be paid through the agency of the labour exchanges, whose primary function it is to help them to find employment.

Suggestions of a similar character to that outlined above have sometimes been criticised on the grounds that a double system of payment administered by the State would cause unnecessary confusion and might also undermine the prestige of the Contributory Insurance System. But such criticism would be less valid under the present scheme, as the proposed allowance would be on a lower scale than insurance benefit and would not, therefore, be calculated to tempt any one to take a

holiday at the taxpayers' expense ; the knowledge, too, that on losing their unemployment benefit they would receive a lower allowance should stimulate the efforts of those still in receipt of benefit to find employment, and should give to those whose benefit had expired an urgent motive to regain their footing within the Insurance System. A man, if he were to receive less in welfare allowance than as insurance benefit, would not be likely to confuse the two, and such a definite and painful distinction between contributory benefit and mere maintenance could only serve to raise the prestige of the former.

Juveniles below the age of eighteen should not be entitled to receive welfare allowances. There is not at the present time, or likely to be for some time to come, any serious lack of employment for young people, especially for girls, if they are really anxious to find work. The Ministry of Labour should direct every effort to the provision of more, and more efficient, training centres, and the receipt of any kind of financial assistance should be made conditional upon attendance at these centres.

Strict rules must, of course, be imposed for the payment of welfare allowances. These might be similar to those now in force for the payment of insurance benefit ; but, unless the notification of vacancies at the exchanges were made compulsory, it would be necessary to include some condition similar in character to the genuinely-seeking-work clause. Welfare allowance would not be paid to persons who had been disqualified for benefit because they were engaged in a trade dispute or had left employment without due cause or had been dismissed for misconduct ; it would be granted only to persons over eighteen years of age who had been insured and who had lost their right to benefit owing to the one cause of insufficient contributions.

In the past, any suggestion to reduce the rate of payment for persons who had exhausted their covenanted benefit has been criticised on the grounds that the hardship is greatest in the later stages of unemployment. It should be borne in mind, however, that according to the present proposals insurance benefit would be paid on a generous scale similar to that at present in force. A man with a wife and three children can now draw 32s. a week in benefit ; and such a high rate of payment would

obviously be quite unjustifiable in the case of persons drawing from a State fund to which they had not themselves contributed. In this connection it is interesting to notice that in Germany the Government has found it necessary to take a similar step to that here suggested, and to reduce payments to those who have drawn benefit for a long period without making a return.

The welfare allowance to be paid by the State should be no more than a bare subsistence allowance. Dependants' allowances would be granted as under the Insurance Scheme, and it would probably be found advisable to reduce these less drastically than the worker's own allowance. In case of absolute need a person in receipt of welfare allowance would be able to turn to the local assistance authorities for further assistance. Such supplementary assistance should, as a general rule, be paid in kind and, wherever possible, test work should be imposed. In no case should it be legal for an applicant to receive more in the way of welfare allowance and relief combined than he would receive as insurance benefit. For those who had been disqualified because they had refused an offer of employment, or who had lost employment owing to misconduct, only institutional relief should be provided. In most areas where there is no general condition of unemployment owing to the failure of the basic industry or industries, it is estimated that the number of persons who would be in receipt of welfare allowances would be small and the additional cost to the local authorities of supplementing these allowances in certain cases would, therefore, not be heavy.

2. *Provision for those over fifty years of age.* It is suggested that the whole charge for the maintenance of insured persons over fifty years of age who have exhausted their insurance benefit should be placed on the local authorities. The reason for this suggestion is that the vast majority of such persons are unlikely again to obtain work of an insurable character, at any rate outside the areas in which they live, and that, consequently, the local assistance authorities within the areas are the most suitable bodies to deal with their needs. A welfare allowance, the maximum amount of which should be fixed by the Ministry of Health, should be paid out of the rates

to any person in this category until such time as he obtains employment or becomes qualified for an old age pension. Persons in this category should continue to register at the labour exchanges, and the local authorities should give them the first opportunity of employment on public works within the area.

The existence of a special problem arising from the position of these older men has not been without recognition in the past, but hitherto no serious attempt has been made to deal with it. In December 1925 the Principal Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Labour said, in evidence before the Blanesburgh Committee :

'It was not uncommon to find that elderly men whether skilled or unskilled (who were applying for benefit) had done little or even no work of any kind for three or four or more years. Moreover, it seemed clear that in the absence of any extraordinary trade activity, comparable with conditions in the later stages of the War, many of them stood a most remote chance of further employment of any kind; their "contributions account" often showed a minus balance as high as 500 or even more.'

Some of those referred to in this quotation were men over sixty-five years of age, who would now be in receipt of pensions; some, owing to declining skill or physique, had lost their full employment capacity. But it must be remembered that a considerable percentage of unemployed men over fifty—about 63 per cent. between the ages of fifty and fifty-four, and 56 per cent. between the ages of fifty-five and fifty-nine—are of high industrial value and are included in Class 'A' of the Ministry of Labour classification. This, however, does not alter the fact that in the existing state of industry an employer having a large choice of applicants of equal capacity will almost invariably give employment to the younger rather than to the older man. It is, in fact, quite a common practice for employers in certain industries when advertising for men, to stipulate that no one over forty-five or fifty years of age need apply. It may be fairly assumed, therefore, that an elderly man who has been out of work long enough to exhaust his insurance benefit, has but a slender chance of regaining his position in industry unless he is fortunate enough to be taken on again by his old employer.

All the available figures disclose the fact that there is

a rapid rise in the percentage of unemployment after the age of forty-five or fifty. It has been estimated that whereas men between the ages of fifty and sixty-four represent 18 per cent. of the total insured population, men between these ages account for 27 per cent. of the totally unemployed insured persons, while another calculation shows that at a time when the average unemployment among insured men between the ages of twenty and forty-four was 9.79 per cent., the average of men between the ages of forty-five and fifty-nine was 12.6 per cent. Whereas in the other age groups the *personnel* of those in receipt of benefit is continually changing, the older men, once they have become unemployed, very often remain permanently on the register until they reach the age of sixty-five and qualify for a pension. The diagram published as an appendix to the Ministry of Labour Gazette for February 1930 shows that the proportion of claimants for benefit who have been unemployed for long periods is much higher amongst the older than amongst the younger men.

In view of the fact that under the proposed scheme the local authorities would not be called upon to bear the main charge of supporting the uncovenanted unemployed below the age of fifty years, it is considered that in normal areas the proposal that they should provide for those over fifty years of age should not be an unduly heavy burden ; but, if on further investigation this were found to be the case, some system of State grants in aid of welfare allowances might be devised.

To qualify for a welfare allowance an applicant would have to prove his age, and to produce a written statement from the insurance officer to the effect that he had been in insured employment and had been disqualified from receipt of further benefit for no other reason than lack of sufficient contributions. Refusal to accept an offer of employment or loss of employment through misconduct or by voluntary relinquishment without due cause would naturally disqualify an applicant from receiving an allowance.

3. *The Distressed Areas.* Most of the difficulty which has been experienced in the administration of the Insurance Fund has been due to the abnormal demands made upon it in certain parts of the country where there has been

exceptional industrial depression. Since the War unemployment has to a great extent been concentrated in a limited number of highly localised industries, such as coal-mining and ship-building, and latterly certain branches of the textile trades. Throughout the worst periods of the trade depression the average unemployment in most of the southern and midland counties has seldom exceeded 10 per cent. of the insured population, and in many prosperous districts it has not been more than 4 or 5 per cent. During the same periods of time the average unemployment in Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Lancashire, and in some of the Welsh and Scottish counties, has been as high as 18 to 25 per cent., and in certain districts such as Jarrow and Bishop Auckland it has reached 40 or 50 per cent. of the insured population.

It is obvious that in any area in which the industrial depression is widespread and persistent, the financial strain upon any system of unemployment insurance must be great, and that the strict application of rules for the payment of benefit, which are perfectly equitable in more prosperous areas, must cause great hardship unless some alternative form of assistance is provided. The investigation into the administration of the Insurance System conducted by the Morris Committee disclosed the fact that all the most serious difficulties experienced in the application of the genuinely-seeking-work clause and of the transitional conditions arose in connection with the distressed areas.

'When a good proportion of persons signing the register have been doing so for months, when the principal mines and blast furnaces or shipyards have been out of action, when it is plain that a tramp in search of work can lead to nothing, then the criteria available in more fortunate areas are no longer to the same extent available.'

The following proposals are based on the theory that it is a mistaken policy to relax the conditions for the payment of insurance benefit in consideration of the needs of particular localities; but they suggest, nevertheless, that in those parts of the country in which, owing to the failure of the basic industry or industries, the inhabitants are really unable to find employment, and where in consequence exceptional distress prevails, as has been the

case recently on the north-east coast, in South Wales, and on the Clyde, special emergency measures are necessary to deal with the situation.

It would be no solution of the problem to allow a large part of the burden of relieving those excluded under a reformed Insurance Scheme to fall upon the local authorities, for such a policy would certainly affect adversely any chance of trade revival. Local rates in the distressed areas are necessarily far higher than in other parts of the country, and, although industry as a whole has been relieved by the derating policy, the prosperous areas still enjoy a considerable advantage. Any further increase in rates would be an additional deterrent to manufacturers intending to establish new industries in districts which were otherwise admirably suited for their purposes, and no course of action should be adopted, therefore, which might lead to an increase in the poor rate in such areas.

It has often been suggested that special grants should be made from the Exchequer to help the local authorities in the distressed areas to defray the cost of public assistance. But such a policy cannot be deemed advisable without the imposition of strict control and supervision. The administration of the Poor Law in areas where there is much unemployment is an arduous and difficult task, and experience has shown that local authorities cannot always be depended upon to carry out their duties on sound lines, political considerations being too apt to influence their course of action. In the past, serious maladministration has occurred in some of the distressed areas, and, although recent changes in local government may lead to a better administration, it seems undesirable that the expenditure on a large scale of money drawn from the National Exchequer should be entrusted to local bodies which are not directly responsible to Parliament.

It is suggested, therefore, that in any area (1) where the average unemployment rises to some fixed percentage of the total insured population; (2) where the industrial depression is likely to be of long duration and calculated to affect the entire population of the area; and (3) where two or more different local authorities are concerned,—it should be within the power of the Government, at the request of the local authorities, to make additional grants out of the Exchequer in aid of rates, and to appoint

Commissioners with wide powers to supervise the administration of all forms of public assistance, to advise the Government as to policy, and to control the expenditure of public money.

The idea of appointing Commissioners for these purposes is no new one; and the Denison House Committee on Public Assistance has even gone so far as to urge that independent executive Commissions on the lines of the Royal Commission of 1834 should be established throughout the country to control and to co-ordinate all expenditure on public assistance. While such an extreme measure appears to be uncalled for in normal areas, where the labour exchanges and the local authorities should be quite competent to carry out their respective duties efficiently and economically, Commissions of this kind would perform a very useful function in special scheduled areas where the burden of unemployment is exceptionally heavy and where hitherto the ordinary machinery of unemployment insurance and public assistance has been unable to bear the strain. Moreover, the appointment of independent Commissioners might make it possible in certain cases to use public money for more constructive purposes than mere relief work. Such officials should be given wide discretionary powers; it should be their duty not only to ensure that the necessary work of public assistance was carried out with the greatest possible economy, but also to investigate the possibility of adopting measures calculated to increase employment in productive industry and to advise the Government accordingly.

It should be within the power of these Commissioners :

1. To permit, should they deem it advisable, a temporary increase out of public money in the legal welfare allowances paid to unemployed persons who have exhausted their insurance benefit :
2. To expedite in every way the transference of unemployed persons to other areas where work can be found for them :
3. To set up and to supervise special training establishments for young persons :
4. To advise the Government as to the desirability of utilising public money for the temporary assistance of industrialists, in order to enable them to give employment : and
5. To advise the Government as to the possibility of assisting in the establishment of new industries within the area.

The appointment of special Commissioners for any area would not affect the administration of the Insurance System ; no relaxation of the conditions for the payment of benefit would be allowed, and the strict principle would be maintained that the Insurance Fund, which is the property of the contributors, must be used only for the payment of benefit and must not be drawn upon for any other purpose. In the case of money provided by the local rates or from the Exchequer, however, different considerations clearly arise, and the Commissioners should be free to use such money in the manner best calculated in their opinion to maintain the health and moral of the people and to restore the prosperity of the district under their control. Some addition to welfare allowances would probably be necessary, and it would rest with the Commissioners to decide whether they should raise temporarily the rates of payment, or whether they should merely extend, under their own strict supervision, the policy of allowing supplementary relief to be granted in necessitous cases. In districts where there is likely to be a permanent surplus of unemployed persons unable to find work in their former occupation, the policy of transference should be continued, and everything possible should be done to increase the mobility of labour. It should be recognised, however, that even in such districts transference cannot in itself solve the whole problem, and the policy of the Commissioners, therefore, should be to stimulate the revival of the industries within their areas and to encourage, where possible, the establishment of new industries.

As a general rule it is considered—and rightly considered—to be a wrong principle to give assistance from the Exchequer to industries working for private profit, or to allow any subsidising of wages out of public money. But the establishment of a completely impartial Commission with powers to investigate the merits of every claim, and to discriminate between the needs of different industries, might make it possible to adopt such a policy in exceptional circumstances, should it appear to be in the public interest.

For years now money has been squandered unproductively. Thousands of unemployed persons have been maintained in idleness, while public money has been used

to supplement charity. Expenditure on relief works throughout the country has been systematically increased, and the Government has done its utmost to encourage local authorities to spend the ratepayers' money in order to assist the unemployed. And yet it has been estimated that on road construction 500,000*l.* will only give direct employment to about 1,000 men for one year. It is at least worthy of consideration, therefore, whether some part of any public money expended for the relief of the unemployed could not be used to enable men to find employment in productive industry. In matters of this kind, however, the Commissioners would act in a purely advisory capacity, and the Government, of course, before giving assistance to industries in the distressed areas, would have carefully to consider the effect that such assistance would have upon similar industries throughout the country.

CUTHBERT HEADLAM.

Art. 2.—CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE, THE MAN.

1. *The Life of Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage.* By C. F. Tucker Brooke, D.Litt. Methuen, 1930.
2. *The Works of Christopher Marlowe.* Edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke, D.Litt. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1910.
3. *Marlowe and his Circle. A Biographical Survey.* By Frederick S. Boas, LL.D. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1929.

It is useful as well as a pleasant pastime to search the writings of the poets for such glimpses of their personalities as may be revealed through the spontaneous outflow of their writings. Often it is less from the direct than the indirect utterance, reading between the lines as they say, that the individuality emerges; but, rightly observed, something of the man himself will be found there. There is, indeed, no surer way to that end.* To take in brevity two pre-eminent examples. In spite of the industrious and even imaginative researches of experts, the positive knowledge that we possess of the personalities, likes and prejudices, of Shakespeare and Spenser remains meagre. What manner of men truly were those men? The only real answer to that question is to be found in the written revelations of their minds and hearts; and though often the result may appear as seen through a glass darkly, for the medium in large measure is conjectural, we yet can discern the man Shakespeare as, amongst other things, shy, temperamental, impressionable, not highly enraptured of the trappings and privileges of kingship; probably slow to kindle but yet, when once aroused, eager, an

* This article was in type before Professor Tucker Brooke's 'Life' and edition of 'Dido,' which heads our list of works reviewed, was published. It is only possible, therefore, in the prominence of this note to point out briefly its value to students of Marlowe. The industry of more than twenty years and the co-operation of other authorities have brought together within this volume a mass of valuable new information about the poet's associations with Canterbury, Cambridge, Deptford, and London; and although Marlowe's personality still must be sought for in his writings, the circumstances and background of the stage on which his life-history and tragedy were enacted have become far clearer through Dr Tucker Brooke's scholarship and devotion: while the rendering of 'Dido' here given is an assurance that the new six-volume edition of the Works, of which this is the first instalment, will be definitive.

inspired whirlwind, and too often, through his superabundant nervous force and mental activities, subject to the tormenting reactions of melancholy and insomnia: or the man Spenser as reserved, sharply sensitive to impressions of persons and events, a passionate idealist over womanhood and natural beauty; one to whom life, except when he was excited, was a vague drifting panorama of coloured dream, and yet, with all his keenness for beauty, one strangely fond of brooding over a bloodshed nastiness. Spenser's frequent detail, in the 'Faerie Queene,' of scattered entrails is evidence of a curious obsession. There is, of course, through following this process, very much else to be discovered of both those complex and impressionable natures; but it is enough to illustrate the point that, unconsciously, every poet in the unhindered outpour of his inspiration to some measure reveals himself. It is a fascinating exercise to catch and combine such aspects of personality as so appear.

In applying this process to the works of Christopher Marlowe we are faced at once with a difficulty not due to the fact of the outward accepted details of his life being fewer than those of Spenser or of Shakespeare. It is that his text, the mass of his writings, was far less extensive than theirs, and even within its narrower limits was more corrupt. Intelligent and devoted editors, in pruning away redundancies, mainly the gags and interpolated 'business' of the low comedians, almost certainly have removed some things, lesser things, which belonged to Marlowe himself and, therefore, were directly expressive of his individuality. It is, however, futile to lament the inevitable, whatever it be; and still there remains plentiful occasion for safe conjecture about him as well as for the nice indulgence of a pleasantly inquisitive temperament.

As a subject for this sort of inquiry Christopher Marlowe is worth while. He was a finer poet and personage than seems generally to be accepted; that casual injustice being partly due to Sir William Watson's quatrain of tribute to Shakespeare which, through the glowing comparison it made, tended unduly to belittle Marlowe. That in 'The Massacre of Paris,' 'The Jew of Malta,' and 'Tamburlaine' especially, passages occur which justify the accusation of the 'drum and cymbal's din' is incontestably true; but beside the clash and the clamour

there yet is much that charms, inspires, and is beautiful. Even in the plays which have the most lurid shocks of melodrama there are passages of music sweetened with flutes and ennobled with the modulated bravery of trumpets, even with the smooth eloquence of the 'gradual violin.' Possibly Marlowe's orchestra liked best to play marches and resounding overtures; but it was not all mere brass.

His work had the quality of youthfulness, its zeal, strength, and confidence, with a rich lyrical gladness, spring-like in its fervour, as well as a most admirable lucidity. No poet, even of modern times, has expressed his ideas more clearly and, though in poetic diction, more directly than Marlowe; and if his range of thought generally was not wide, exalted or deep, for he had little of the wealth of originality, introspection, and spiritual insight which marked the wondering, adventurous mind of Shakespeare (with the sudden confusions or complexities it frequently came to), there yet was a clarion straightforwardness about him which made it impossible to misunderstand his meaning. Always his figures marched definitely across the stage. They were painted in clear, unfading colours. And he was more than the poet of the 'mighty line' of popular appreciation, though, indeed, he also was that without qualification. It is impossible to open almost any page of his verse without discovering some passage of sonorous music, rhythmic eloquence, and the power that rouses.

'Proud fury and intolerable fit,
That dares torment the body of my Love,
And scourge the Scourge of the immortal God!
Now are those Spheres where Cupid used to sit,
Wounding the world with wonder and with love,
Sadly supplied with pale and ghastly death:
Whose darts do pierce the centre of my soul.
Her sacred beauty hath enchanted Heaven;
And had she lived before the siege of Troy,
Helen, whose beauty summoned Greece to arms
And drew a thousand ships to Tenedos
Had not been named in Homer's Iliads.'

Magnificent stuff!—gathered at random; and how he loved to mouth a string of sounding names!

' And ride in triumph through Persepolis ?
 Is it not brave to be a King, Techelles ?
 Usumcasane and Theridamas,
 Is it not passing brave to be a King,
 And ride in triumph through Persepolis ? '

There is no slovenliness in the phrasing anywhere. Every word represents what it is intended to represent, every adjective used is just rightly effective ; and although, compared with the majority of the greater poets, there is some dearth of such felicities as startle or move the heart with their originality and beauty, there is none of the mere striving after effect, the sign of a lesser man, which when it fails is either painfully pathetic or ridiculous. Not infrequently, as will be seen, Marlowe tumbled to bathos, but always that was due to the eloquent over-toppling of a hazardous image and not to any carelessness of rhythmic speech. The truth is that, especially in his earlier work, Marlowe with his tireless youthful energy, enjoyed what he was doing. His two sestiams of ' Hero and Leander,' in themselves a lovely poem unmarked by age, and his last work, left incomplete ; and ' Tamburlaine,' his first play to be publicly acted and probably the first that he wrote, especially have abounding lyrical quality as well as the fresh, unfailing flow which keeps the mind of the reader alert and unweary.

Another characteristic which prevented the muse of Marlowe from degenerating to slatternliness or jogtrot was his mastery of the methods and opportunities of the tripartite stage of his time. In that department assuredly he was a highly competent craftsman as well as a passionate artist. The details of his ' plots,' with their excursions and alarums, were sometimes so preposterous—especially in ' The Jew of Malta,' which deteriorated as it went along, there were many loose threads—that if at the end of a scene opportunity had allowed for an immediate contemplative retrospect, their impossibility must have been manifest ; but no sooner had Gaveston, or Theridamas, or Barabas, made his speeches and passed beyond the bordering curtains than in came other characters, with their marchings and oratory, to continue the story without pause ; and so through the uninterrupted course of dramatic events the preposterous was overlooked or even was justified. The value to the Elizabethan dramatist of

an unresting flow of incident on the stage, free of languors, interruptions, and curtain-calls, is more evident in Marlowe than in Shakespeare, for the reason that while he depended mainly upon action—with Marlowe it was action, action pretty well all the time—Shakespeare gave his characters thought as well as action, and thought in itself worth the expression; he gave them also the verbal means for saying it with leisure and supremely well.

Already, therefore, it may be seen—from reading him and from reading between his lines—that Marlowe was a vital and confident person, alert and happy in his abundant spirits, and, further, that he was likeable. This circumstance, reflected in his verse, for with all the tragedies its expression yet denotes the spirit of one enjoying his work, receives the added witness of Edward Blunt in the dedicatory letter to Sir Thomas Walsingham which prefaces *'Hero and Leander,'* where he records 'the impression of the man, that hath been dear unto us, living an after life in our memory'; to which verbal wreath may be added Shakespeare's reference in *'As You Like It'* to Marlowe as the 'dead shepherd' with his 'saw of might,' an expression that holds, it may be felt, a note of wistful admiration and affection.

Marlowe's bright lucidity of words, besides being the consequence of a natural and habitual precision of mind, was also a result of his vivid imagination. Whatever he visioned he saw with completeness—to the last gaiter-button; a quality necessary to any worthily outstanding playwright or novelist. But the virtue had its defects, as was shown in his sometimes seeing things to which it were better that he had been blind. As Venus says to Juno in *'The Tragedie of Dido'*:

'But I will tear thy eyes fro forth thy head
And feast the birds with their blood-shotten balls.'

This tendency to see over-definitely or too much is not only to be found in the play and dialogue of his actors, but also in his own mental view of facts. Misled by its name he saw the Black Sea as a 'cole-black sea,' just as Edmund Spenser in his romantic visioning of the Red Sea, in the *'Faerie Queene,'* must needs refer to its 'blood-red billows,' which is through enthusiasm to carry a tendency beyond the borders of reality and safety.

It was, however, the close and detailed relation of Marlowe's imagination with the definite truths of things which made his plays and poetry so effective. Being a man of eager impulses he was apt to rush to extremes; and so it is that the opposite ends of his achievement, the bathos and the beauty, were both brought out. Moreover, like the true stage craftsman, he was not altogether averse from securing theatrical effects which might not always have been justified. Among the many splendid passages in which true vision is expressed in the 'mighty line,' and they have qualities beyond questioning, are the description of Leander's swimming the Hellespont, heroic verse in equal compass unexcelled; the account given by Æneas in 'Dido' of the siege and downfall of Troy; and the grievings of the despair of Faustus—'the Serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus!'; the spirit of the telling and the details of these and other fine passages showing that Marlowe saw vividly all that he impassionately pictured, with the result that his readers can feel and see it too.

But the bathos and the brutality are not to be denied, and it would be shirking the truth of the spiritual portraiture of the man for us not to notice them. With Marlowe the excuse cannot be made that, like the poor humours of the Shakespearean minor-clowns, they were concessions made to gratify those in the cheaper places—those with the clapping hands and the boisterous laughter. To be loud and brutal in the Cambyse vein was expected by Elizabethan audiences, and it is not to Marlowe's credit that it was he who first thought of softening and humanising the clap-trap and sanguinary conventions of the time. Indeed, it is clear that he was willing to gratify to the full the expectations of his patrons for theatrical blood and terror, and within his compass fed them with horrors that to our more settled judgment are less horrific than absurd. Such processes as we witness in 'Tamburlaine,' of Bajazet, the captured Turkish emperor, beating out his brains against the side of the cage of his confinement, followed by his wife, Zabina, after a speech of madness, doing the same thing, are incapable of wringing, or even of convincing for one mistaken moment the modern heart. It requires natural truth. To read in 'Lear' of the wilful blinding of Gloster is far more sickening and dreadful,

because the methods of it and the victim are more humanly natural.

Such a difference as that between them in art and truth marks the great inferiority of Marlowe to Shakespeare. It is a question of sympathy and tact, which Shakespeare discovered for himself as his practice and experience progressed ; for nothing in Marlowe is so grossly repulsive as are the details of the cruelties in 'Titus Andronicus,' for which, however, Shakespeare as merely a collaborator or reviser is only partly to be judged. Marlowe's weakness is found in his not showing more natural justification for the murders as they occurred. With him they were generally too casual, haphazard, and wanton. In 'Hamlet' there is more than enough of the black spectacle of violent death, but reason for it is given in the motive of the play and the faults of its persons. To Marlowe, as to his immediate contemporaries, the murder itself was generally sufficient ; and sometimes it may be suspected that he put it in merely to gratify the popular appetite for blood ; and, like others of his day, tended to overdo the quantity.

It is legitimately amusing to take note of the wholesale series of murders, set going without reticence, in 'The Massacre of Paris' ; the play which showed that Marlowe's sympathies in partisan religion, then, as at other times amongst earnest men, largely political—and forgetting for awhile the accusations of his atheism—were not with the Catholics. In this tragedy the parade of violent death is prodigious. It begins with the Duke of Guise, disclosed as the villain of the piece, arranging with an apothecary for the supply of a pair of poisoned gloves by which the 'old Queen' may be secretly murdered. At the same time he plans with a soldier to shoot the Lord High Admiral. We see the gloves given and the Queen's consequent death :

'my brain-pan breaks,
My heart doth faint. I die.' (*She dies.*)

The soldier proves less expert, for he discharges his musket only to wound the Admiral, who is taken to his bed, where we see him stabbed to death by a band of the conspirators, including Guise, who stamps upon the corpse which is afterwards hanged on a tree in the full publicity of the stage. Meanwhile, Protestants are chased by the 'Guisians,' and two of their responsible thinkers, Seroune

and Ramus, are killed; when enter Navarre and the Prince of 'Condy' with their schoolmasters. Instantly the 'pedants' are slain, while the princely ones depart to inform the King of the sharp vigour of their enemies. Then, 'five or six Protestants with books' appear and kneel in a group, to be at once killed and their corpses dragged away. At that point the King in his physical and spiritual weakness is seized with a 'gripping pain,' so that he dies; and still the game goes on, with a passing interlude during the new King's coronation of a Cutpurse being deprived of an ear. The Duke Joyeux is then murdered 'off,' and one would like to know the reason for that sudden unseemly reticence. However, at once we are back in the red orgy; and see Murgeroun shot for having been the lover of the wife of Guise. But the time now has come for the divine repayment. Guise himself is stabbed to death; and, finally, after the ducal villain's Cardinal brother has been visibly strangled, the new King slays a friar who already had struck him with a poisoned knife; so that his Majesty also dies and the jolly play closes with a funeral procession.

Marlowe, of course, could do and did better than that, as the love-passages of 'Dido,' the sweet loyalties of Abigail in 'The Jew of Malta,' and the despairs of Faustus prove; but yet it marks the limited measure of the man and points the truth that he could not rise altogether above the common values of the stage and the audiences of his time. Its strong Protestant bias, of course, helped in the popular acceptance of that play, especially as it was less than twenty years since the massacre of St Bartholomew's Day had horrified the world. Shakespeare, who began with many like crudities of plot and passion, did rise triumphantly out of the ruck of the public bad taste of his time and thereby achieved his crowning immortality; but that was not the only respect in which Marlowe proved the inferior. He had little tenderness, and very little pity. It might appear that towards the end of 'Dr Faustus' a sorrow is felt for the helplessness of that fatal student, brought through his own temerity and want of spiritual strength to final ruin. But it is difficult to distinguish between the pity of it and the rhetoric; and, at least, it may be said that probably Marlowe at times really did feel, but could not feel deeply. Possibly his

heart was still too incurably young for the nobler imagination of love.

Rarely did he give to his strong men—and clearly he admired strong, confident men who grasped at the stars—a touch of sympathy to mend their ruthlessness. Tamburlaine could kill his own firstborn son, Calyphas, without compunction in a scene where a little tenderness would enormously have increased its power; but yet the tyrant's love for Zenocrate, his wife, was shown to be real. He refused her pleadings when ambition required him to be cruel; but at her instance he was merciful to her father who otherwise must have been humiliated and murdered after the manner of all the other defeated captives; while apparently his grief over her death has the thought and feeling of greatness. Marlowe's Tamburlaine belonged to the colossal, to the supreme. He towered and with his griefs as with his animosities and cruelties filled a large stage, and for that very greatness possessed the more thoroughly the heart of his creator.

To Marlowe the love of women and men was mere passion, and generally hard passion, in which the pursuit and conquest of the person desired was the sole thing.

'Love is not full of pity, as men say,
But deaf and cruel where he means to prey';

an ideal, if such it could be called (as it can't), far removed from the witty resistance and hidden emotion of Beatrice, the unfaltering loyalty of Imogen, the glad, courageous, and absolute self-surrender of Juliet. There were few illusions in Marlowe. His mind was at once too rapid, energetic, and exact for that; and certainly the qualities he most admired in men were ruthless strength of purpose and a mind and heart that refused to waver under disaster. He preferred his own ambitious Mortimer to his weakly wilful Edward the Second; whereas Shakespeare had for his own second Richard, in his dreaminess and helplessness, an evident sympathy that was not given to the powerful, confident, and trampling Bolingbroke.

Although in the general body of Marlowe's verse there was little contemplative thought, he yet pondered curiously over the mysteries of life and death and revealed much of his perturbations and uncertainties, especially in the soliloquies and questionings of 'Doctor Faustus.' Was

Marlowe an atheist, as in his own day he was called? In the true and modern meaning of the word the answer must be, No. He did say through the mouth of Machiavelli in the prologue to 'The Jew of Malta,'

'I count Religion but a childish Toy,
And hold there is no sin but Ignorance';

but there is a long flight between such an assertion, spoken, be it remembered, by the arch-materialist of politics, criticising the state of childish superstition to which much of the religion of the time was reduced, and such frank denial of the existence of God as Marlowe has been roughly adjudged guilty of making. That he was even, at best or worst, what now is deemed an Agnostic, may be doubted. It is clear that he could not accept the more miraculous aspects of the simple religious faith which satisfied the majority in his day, and since—for the one-eyed obstructionists are not solely confined to Tennessee; and that he loudly and scornfully rejected what was palpably superstitious and insincere. But yet he was concerned over the unanswerable whys of existence and the mysteries that enshroud the divine. Such ponderings as this of his very mediæval Mephistophilis are significant and not infrequent. Answering Faustus's question as to where Hell is, the tempted and tormented spirit answers that it is—

'Within the bowels of these elements
Where we are tortured and remain for ever.
Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed
In one self place; for where we are is Hell
And where Hell is must we ever be;
And, to conclude, when all the world dissolves
And every creature shall be purified
All places shall be Hell that is not Heaven.'

An answer that foreshadows modern thought; and a statement—no solitary expression of Marlowe's brooding over the baffling infinities—that shows him to have been when his mind was brought to it, a deeper and sincerer thinker than would otherwise have appeared. No atheist penned those words. Also, remembering that those were persecuting days, that statement proves his spiritual courage. It was an age of frank and curious inquiry. A new world had come to quicken the knowledge and imagination of men; and as the tales of the sailors showed

—and Master Richard Hakluyt faithfully reported—the multitude were prepared to be credulous and to believe all and more than they were told about monsters and wonders and men whose heads did grow beneath their shoulders. But while anything was possible in the visible world, there must be no tampering with the sanctities of the invisible, and because Marlowe put his questions and comments into the mouths of his characters, disturbing the conventional—

'Then if there be a Christ as Christians say,
But in their deeds deny him for their Christ'

and probably in his private talk was careless over impressions, he came to be regarded as a thunderous and militant atheist, denying and deriding all. But possibly, as Dr Boas and others have suggested from the facts associated with Marlowe's tragical death—murder most foul, and not the accident of a 'drunken brawl'—political doubts and partisan angers had something to do with that bitterness. It is all very complicated and evidently prejudiced and little known. But it always has seemed difficult for saints still in life not to loathe those with whom they disagree, and still more difficult for them to refrain from saying so.

To pass forthwith to Marlowe's sense of humour is not so abrupt a process as might at first appear, for his loud refusal to be credulous was certainly touched with irony, and that is the shadowy bridge by which we cross the chasm. Did not he describe Moses as a juggler? It can be imagined that the flippancy was accompanied with laughter which, though possibly genial in its origins, was yet a galling irreverence to those who heard and whose gift of humour was of a texture and quality different from his. Mr A. H. Bullen, whose expert authority on the Elizabethan writers is ever to be gratefully remembered, asserted his 'conviction that Marlowe never attempted to write a comic scene.' The exact definition of 'comic,' and how much was meant by the expression 'comic scene,' must be left to the individual judgment; but yet it can be asserted also with conviction and examples that Marlowe had humour, although it did not interpenetrate his resounding seriousness as richly and brightly as it might have done. How welcome would such as Macbeth's Porter, or Touchstone, or Dogberry have been among the dark and violent issues of 'Edward the Second' and 'The Jew of Malta';

though from the repeated references to the bottle-nose of Barabas it is pretty certain that, as with Shylock in some theatres, he, too, was turned into a comic bait. As to Marlowe's humour, the Seven Deadly Sins in 'Doctor Faustus' on the one hand, and the daring speech, with its *double-entendre*, of the Soldier in 'The Massacre of Paris' on the other, with friars and devils and servants doing knockabout and 'slapstick' business in between, retained and accepted by the editors, give proof enough that he could make laughter both for high and for low consumption. The pity is that there was so little of it; and so little of it really good. If only Marlowe could have been more playful and more naturally familiar with the commonplace—who rarely were commonplace—people of his days! But there again he followed the convention of generally requiring high examples, emperors and queens, with chariots, and plumes and shining circumstance and much shedding of blood, 'the God of War's rich livery,' for the expression of his dramatic seriousness. In view of that dearth of vital ordinary people it is positively refreshing to meet the Nurse in 'The Tragedie of Dido.' This old lady with her amorous philosophy—but she did not know she was talking to Cupid himself—was a true distant relative of the immortal Nurse who discussed in similar vein the very young precocities of Juliet. So genial is this brief episode in Marlowe that his Nurse's subsequent unhappiness at Dido's hands is disquieting. Better had it been left untold. Perhaps it is as well, therefore, that Shakespeare did not divulge the griefs of his old lady when the final climax of her weak interference had come in the tomb of the Capulets.

So far as is divulged in his plays, Marlowe's sense of humour, inadequate, was chiefly ironic, and especially alert to the bankrupt poverty of power and greatness when, their courses run, they return to the common clay, to the natural matter of Mother Earth, with the inspiration spent. This, of course, is in the thought of all eager minds impressed with the transiency of life and the hollowness of its magnificence. Emperors playing with baubles under the mocking shadow of Death. Musing upon that theme, with which all his plays are in some measure concerned, Marlowe's irony was bound to lapse to melancholy; for he, too, was greatly ambitious.

'What glory is there in a common good
That hangs for every peasant to achieve?
That like I best that flies beyond my reach . . .
Although my downfall be the deepest hell.'

In the plays the ambition displayed was principally for power, though Barabas, of course, was driven by the desire for riches; the only god of the Israelites in the view of the Elizabethans—and some others. In 'Tamburlaine' we see the superbness, in 'Edward the Second' the meanness, of the great fault or quality through which the angels fell. In both it came to tragedy; but Tamburlaine laughed with loud scorn at the Death that conquers all, while Edward whimpered; and Marlowe, therefore, loved the more his Scythian Shepherd. Had he not so loved him there might have been no sequel to the first part of 'Tamburlaine,' the 'general welcomes' notwithstanding. It is, indeed, a pity that Marlowe had not more gentleness, for harshness and bitterness are heard too often in his dramatic song, and with more sympathy it must have been greater.

Yet he was young—only twenty-nine—when he died, with his tale of work ended. Though born in the same year as he, Shakespeare at the time of Marlowe's death had published only 'Venus and Adonis' and given no glimpse of the genius that was to enrich the world with such as 'Macbeth,' 'Henry the Fourth,' and 'Much Ado.' Might not, therefore, Marlowe have ripened in a similar way, especially as his early plays were better in force, form, and quality, than the earliest plays of Shakespeare? We can only judge by appearances, and give an uncertain answer. The two sestiads of 'Hero and Leander' are the most highly finished thing that he wrote. It is a poem so superior to his earlier verse of the kind, moving so strongly, swiftly, easily, naturally, with such clearness of vision and clarion music of rhythm and phrase, that he could hardly have surpassed it. It was probably his last work, and therefore leaves the question of his future poetical growth impossible of a confident answer. Yet it is enough to permit our placing him with Keats as one of those who died untimely with greater work to come. And even more than with Keats, who grows daily in the strength and brightness of his immortality, Marlowe's name was writ in water.

On the other hand, in his plays after 'Tamburlaine,' although he varied his measures and made bold venturings,

exploring new fields of action and fancy, much of his lyric quality and confidence was lost, and with the solitary exception of 'Dr Faustus,' his most ambitious and individual work, he gained in other respects practically nothing. His dramatic gift, though sincere, was showy. He had the true theatrical urge. Possibly, that, also, though it helped him to catch the eyes and ears of his contemporaries, was a part of the pity of it. He was glad to please the patrons of the theatres, and knowing that his public wanted action, emotion, thunder, but especially action, he gave it to them without stint. Yet, the difference! Merely to think of the warm and diverse humanity of Shakespeare's comedies, histories, and tragedies is to mark their relative values as playwrights, and to know that Jaques, Miranda, Bottom, Malvolio, Benedick, Mrs Quickly, Prospero, Mercutio, Falstaff—not to stress the immortals, Puck, Oberon, and Ariel—were as far beyond the reach of the poetic aspirations of Marlowe as are the antipodes from the burning Caucasus. He simply could not, and that is the plain truth of it. The only respect in which the two were somewhat alike was in their anachronisms, and there Marlowe, a Cambridge graduate, had a little the better of it.

Yet within his limitations Marlowe had greatness, and no truer testimony to his quality is available than in Shakespeare's artistic regard for him. It is fascinating, in this search through the poems and plays in the hope of discovering a personality, to recognise the frequent evidence of Marlowe's influence on the mind and work of Shakespeare; to be found not only in quotations, like that already noted in 'As You Like It,' and in Pistol's 'hollow-pamper'd jades of Asia,' mocking Tamburlaine's 'Holla, ye pampered jades of Asia!'—a lovely touch and not unkind, to borrow from Marlowe's extravagance, this burlesque, for Pistol often is mock-Marlowe—but also in the very close similarities of language and scenes which show how well his works were studied and their phrases and spirit absorbed, incidentally, it must be confessed, to prove Shakespeare a good deal of a plagiarist; though possibly he did not suspect the full extent of his borrowings. Calphurnia's speech in 'Julius Caesar' about the signs and portents accompanying the great tragedy is reminiscent of a long descriptive passage from Marlowe's trans-

lation of Lucan; there are extraordinary and continuous similarities between the plays of 'Edward the Second' and 'Richard the Second'; in 'Dido' we have a speech so like that of the First Player that it must have been in Shakespeare's mind when he was penning 'Hamlet'; while 'The Jew of Malta' obviously suggested much of the character and vicissitudes of Shylock, with his only daughter; and there is a great deal more in Shakespeare, here and there, that was plainly derived from Marlowe; similar phrases and poetic reflections clearly marked. Take this, for an example:

'Where all is whist and still
Save that the sea playing on yellow sand' . . .

The 'whist' and the 'yellow sand' are too significant for that passage not to have come to the inspiration of Shakespeare when his heart was first singing the song of Ariel. Such passing hints and discoveries are a reward to those who hunt in these fairy lands, happily not forlorn. The circumstance of Shakespeare's proved appreciation of Marlowe's work as a poetic dramatist is worth the pondering; for it shows that to him, who in that world was to prove far and away the greatest of them all, Marlowe mattered and had much that was worth a poet's and a dramatist's admiration, and much from which to learn. Whether they knew each other personally cannot be decided. If they did, their acquaintance was probably slight, for Shakespeare was slow to begin, and, in his shyness and sensitiveness, would have been diffident of approaching Marlowe, already in the loud blaze of his glory. How could he, the poor hack, laboriously dressing-up other men's plays, hoping some day to be known as the writer of his own, and still remembering, although his new poem on Venus and her love for Adonis was 'out,' that only a little while before he had been helping a scant livelihood by minding the horses of playgoers—how could he approach, without very definite encouragement, that confident and triumphant lord of splendid verse?

There is rather more evidence that Marlowe enjoyed the friendship of Edmund Spenser. In 'Tamburlaine' four lines appear that were taken bodily from the as yet unpublished 'Faerie Queene.' The how and why of it is a mystery—probably the manuscript had been lent to

him, and unconsciously he, too, cribbed them, or possibly borrowed them inaptly in a freakishness of youthful exuberance; but, whatever be the cause of it, there they are! Still more curious is the fact that in 'Dido' two lines occur which very shrewdly challenge conjecture.

'Whose hideous echoes make the welkin howl
And all the woods *Eliza* to resound.'

No *Eliza* has any part in the play. It is, or it seems to be, an unwarrantable intrusion, inconsequent; but may it not have been a touch of ironical fun at the expense of the writer of the 'Epithalamium,' wherein the echoes of the woods resound at the end of every lovely stanza, persistently? * Also, like most of his contemporaries, including Shakespeare, Spenser went out of his way to flatter Queen Elizabeth—*Eliza*—by mentioning her adoringly in his works; and so, probably, we find Marlowe, frankly independent of spirit, and in challenging boldness forthright, too hasty and proud himself to flatter her, making this mock of them all and laughing an impudent protest against such conventional and artificial adulation; whereby perhaps we discover yet another trait, and this time humorous, of that little-known man and insufficiently appreciated poet.

And what of Marlowe himself? Too vital to be a shadow, he lives, though in broken glimpses, in his works; and unfortunate it is that through his having been cut off before his prime they were so few. But there he is, in evidence sufficient, full of the lusty youthful zest of life, thrusting, confident, scornful, loudly and consciously triumphant, taking his risks and rewards with a splendid indifference and courage, mocking the established, carelessly defying the powers of credulousness and ignorance, living to the full every inch, ounce, and moment of his day. Ingram Frizer's murderous dagger, on that penultimate evening of May in 1593, making its black history, marred a future of genius—but of how much greatness and quality to come, not even the gods can say.

C. E. LAWRENCE.

* Dyce, in his 1865 edition of the Works of Marlowe, has a footnote to this '*Eliza*.' He says, 'I.e., "Dido." So, probably, our poet wrote: but it should be "*Elissa*." "*Nec me meminisse pigebit Elissæ*," Virgil, *Æn.* iv. 335.' But, of course, it was a deliberate touch of jolly mischief by Master Kit, who took the teasing opportunity.

Art. 3.—THE MUSIC OF LIFE.

It is generally recognised that the modern school of revolutionary composers represents the greatest break with the past that has taken place in musical history for about three hundred years, but it is not perhaps always realised that the difference between their art and that which has reigned supreme in Europe and America for so long a time is not only, or even mainly, a technical distinction of idiom or of musical language, but a fundamental divergence of outlook. The revolutionary to-day is not merely atonal or polytonal. He seems positively to glory in being purely cerebral—in making his art unemotional and unromantic—just sound matter cunningly contrived, and nothing more. The thought of its having anything in the nature of a message to deliver is abhorrent to him. There are, of course, many composers among our contemporaries to whom these remarks do not apply and who yet are far from being old-fashioned. But to a large extent it would appear to be a correct description of the music of Stravinsky, Schönberg (since 'Pierrot Lunaire'), Bartok, Berg, and von Webern.

Curiously enough, a kind of justification for this attitude is alleged by their more devoted adherents to be found in Mozart, the glory of whose music, it is said, is that it means nothing. In a certain degree it is true that Mozart—like Haydn and other composers in the eighteenth century, so far as instrumental music is concerned,—wrote exquisite sound patterns. But this is a very incomplete account of his art, or of that of any of his contemporaries, for that matter, and it is clearly an inaccurate description of his operatic and liturgical works. Even as regards his instrumental creations, the notion is only partially correct, and mostly in the case of that written in the earlier part of his career. The greatest of his instrumental compositions are by no means mere tonal designs. No doubt, the idea of the 'dæmonic' element in Mozart has been exaggerated by some writers, but his finest quartets, concertos, and symphonies, constantly and unmistakably express moods and feelings—even if they be simple ones—gaiety, sorrow, wistful regret, tender passion, and so on. Frequently the apparent simplicity of the technical means employed—the economy of notes

and chords—deceives the careless listener, who perhaps misses the delicate intricacy of thought and of emotion inherent in the music. Really Mozart is, though outwardly straightforward, one of the most baffling and subtle of composers. The last word has by no means been said about his music. He is in some respects more difficult to write about than are creators such as Beethoven and Wagner, who obviously had 'messages to deliver.' Those who suggest that his music signifies nothing betray their own lack of understanding. It actually contains a great deal of meaning, but it is just because the latter is not so clear to see as in the case of some of the other great masters, that those who really have nothing—or very little—to say, are wrongly 'fathered' upon Mozart. The pregnancy and suggestiveness of such great movements as the Andante from the 40th Symphony in G minor, the Finale of the 'Jupiter,' or the opening Allegro of the piano concerto in C minor—to name only a few instances—are there for us to discover, even though they be more hidden than the profound heart-searchings of Beethoven.

The greatest music is, I venture to suggest, always profound—which does not necessarily mean that it is always in deadly earnest. There can be profundity of soul, depth of character, in light music,—as we know from many of Bach's dances, and from much of de Falla's art—and in witty creations, such as the finale of Beethoven's Eighth Symphony or Strauss' 'Don Quixote.' But during this century, and especially since the war, there has been a tendency to rebel against the musical expression of spirituality. The war doubtless had much to do with this. Its effect was a natural inclination to react against the habit of dwelling on the deeper things of life, and this reaction has been partly responsible for the pervading and persistent vogue for jazz, with its clever, flippant, intoxicating strains—not so far removed in outlook as in technique from the ingenious sound sensations of the modern revolutionary composers. Then again, we live in a mechanical age, which is apt to lead us to rush quickly and thoughtlessly along the highroads of material enterprise, without much regard for the deeper spiritual values. It is as though composers were anxious to avoid anything that smacked, however faintly, of a musical sermon. The nineteenth-century idea of Beet-

hoven being a great teacher, as well as a great musician, stank in their nostrils. They regarded it as a piece of impertinence for a work of art to have ethical qualities, and if the worth of a piece of music were to be measured by its alleged moral sense, in the narrow meaning of the term, they would have been justified. Actually, however, neither Beethoven nor any other composer can preach by means of music, for the simple reason that music is intrinsically incapable of playing such a part. What is true of him and of all the greatest geniuses of the art is that their music has a spiritual quality in the broadest and finest sense of the term—in that it is a direct, though sometimes unconscious, reflection of their reactions to their life's experiences. It has been said that the works of Beethoven's middle period, in particular, possess a moral tone which, in the eyes of the twentieth century, is apt to be offensive. Now, music can have an ethical influence, but this is certainly not directly, if at all, proportionate to its artistic value. Many inferior hymn tunes and military marches of little artistic merit, for instance, may tend to promote virtue or bravery, as the case may be. It is, however, also the case that a masterpiece may have an elevating effect, and when this happens we cannot draw a definite dividing line between this greatness of soul and its artistic worth. When Bach convincingly expresses the message of Christ by those famous recitatives in the first part of the St Matthew Passion, we cannot deny the ennobling influence—the moral effect, if the term be understood in its highest and widest significance—nor can we differentiate it entirely from artistic merit, because the latter is largely bound up with the music's extraordinary aptness to the meaning of the words to which it is wedded. Similarly with works such as Beethoven's C minor symphony or violin concerto. They may be 'moral' in the sense that they reveal an attitude towards the great questions of life itself—man and his destiny, his hopes and fears and loves. But their artistic quality is partially, at any rate, interwoven with their very fitness as vehicles for conveying these vital themes in terms of musical speech. The creations of Beethoven's third period are commonly placed in a different category, because it is said that they afford us glimpses into the infinite such as are not vouchsafed to

us even in the greatest of his earliest compositions. This is true, but they only carry the principle of spirituality one stage further. Once we grant that spiritual values are related to, though not entirely or necessarily identical with, artistic ones, we can hardly deny that the profound and mysterious quality which we rightly discern in the last five string quartets, the final sonatas for pianoforte, the Ninth Symphony, and the Missa Solemnis, plays an enormous part in determining their æsthetic greatness.

It is in this kind of way, after all, that music is ultimately a vital part of life, as it must be for any one to whom music is not merely a source of amusement or entertainment. There is music for all sorts of temperaments and for all species of moods, nor need we deny the value of the lightest and most superficial compositions in appropriate circumstances. We cannot—even those of us who are devoted to the art—always be in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of Bach's Passion music, or 'Parsifal,' or a Beethoven quartet. There are times when we crave something more flippant, not even the gay refinements of the dance airs of Bach and Mozart and the Elizabethans, or the attractive strains of Gounod's unphilosophic, yet effective, setting of 'Faust,' but perhaps the intoxicating, thoughtless insignificance of some modern foxtrot or waltz tune. But they are not what we think of when we speak of the music of life. They skim over the surface of things and have but little real bearing on our lives. Yet, however æsthetically inferior they may be and however transitory their appeal, they have, perhaps, this much in common with a great deal of the music that has been highly esteemed by some connoisseurs of the art—that they are in essence divorced from the real issues of life. When music is but a sound pattern, as it often was in the eighteenth century, and as many have striven to make it again in our day, it cannot reach the same level of artistic quality as that which strikes at the deepest roots of our existence. There is in a great deal of modern music something mechanical—suitable, perhaps, to an age of machinery, but not compatible with great artistic value,—something artificial, not in the commendatory sense denoting skilled craftsmanship, but in the less eulogistic meaning of the term whereby a work is described as evincing technical resource and ingenuity

and even intellectual qualities but as lacking emotional or spiritual warmth. The real masterpieces—the greatest works of Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, and others—are both skilful and profound. But just as in the sphere of dance music so many (though not all) of the twentieth-century jazz tunes appear to be turned out by a kind of mechanical process, like sausages out of a machine, and follow a deadly monotony of rhythmic formulæ and instrumental effects, in contrast with the sincere and spontaneous melodies of Johann Strauss and Sullivan, so, in the world of more serious endeavour, there are apparent an insincerity and even a cynicism which are sharply distinguished from the inward conviction that impelled the great composers to give utterance. Johann Strauss, one feels, wrote his waltzes at white heat. He had to produce them. They are as natural, as unforced, as a spring bubbling from the ground. This is not to deny the consummate workmanship and the careful industry which clearly went to the composition of them—quite the contrary; we know that those elements have been required for the vast majority of the most valuable musical creations of the world. But as with Bach or Wagner—or any of the great geniuses—so with Johann Strauss, ingenuity and technique are used as means to an end, whereas with many jazz pieces and with much other music of the twentieth century, they appear to be regarded as an end in themselves.

There are, however, some modern composers to whom this does not apply. From the tremendous instrumental resources for which Mahler calls—particularly in his colossal Eighth Symphony which the B.B.C. let us hear recently—it might, in theory, be assumed that technical mastery and external effect were the aims which he had chiefly in view, or at any rate that they had got the better of him. Yet it is not so. The means which he employed do not seem disproportionate to the purpose for which they are used. They are justified in practice, and so far from obscuring, they actually enhance, the spiritual grandeur of his conception. They are, in this work, more imposing than those which he utilises anywhere else, but the intense inward conviction which is manifest in the work is in keeping with the sincerity which he evinces elsewhere. The Fourth Symphony, for instance, is one of the most intimate of orchestral compositions. It

echoes thoughts and feelings which we have long experienced but for which we had not previously found expression. It is the first really simple symphonic music since Schubert. Its melodies are so unpretentious, so charming, that we rub our eyes and almost wonder why no one else had thought of them throughout all these years. The same intimacy of personal expression inhabits 'Das Lied von der Erde,' which is, perhaps, his greatest masterpiece—a cycle of six movements for two soloists and orchestra, wherein the soul seems to pass through the shadows of autumn, the gaiety of youth, the brilliance of earthly beauty, until at the end it fades into the infinite in hushed phrases of unearthly loveliness.

Mahler has not hitherto been valued at his true worth outside Central Europe and Holland, and even in Germany and Austria opinions have been sharply divided. He has been overshadowed by his more dazzling, more ostentatious contemporary, Richard Strauss. But I believe that appreciation of the music of Mahler will grow, and that the reputation of Strauss will somewhat diminish even though it will probably always remain considerable. My reason for this belief is that Mahler was essentially a composer who spoke from the heart and whose message, once it has found a response in his listeners, continues to satisfy; whereas Strauss is to a considerable extent a brilliant showman, the appeal of whose music is tremendous at first acquaintance but less absorbing as time goes on. I used to take great delight in Strauss' symphonic poems. But they do not wear quite so well as I had hoped they would, and repeated hearings make one more conscious of that superficiality which, though not ever present, is unfortunately frequent in his work. 'Don Juan' to-day seems, somehow, to belong to a period before the 'Flying Dutchman.' At any rate, the early operas of Wagner appear so much more alive and convincing than this post-Wagnerian production that the latter now presents itself as being almost old-fashioned by comparison. It does not bear constant repetition with the same success as the greatest masterpieces do. Dare one suggest that the satiety and weariness of 'Don Juan' depicted in one part of the score is shared by some, at least, of Strauss' listeners? For a modern music lover such as myself there is something much more vital in Monteverdi's three-

hundred-year-old opera 'Orfeo' than in the twentieth-century morbidity of 'Salome' and 'Elektra'! Strauss can be immensely attractive outwardly, but there is, as a rule, no great depth in his music. The wit and ingenuity of 'Till Eulenspiegel' are delightful, but superficial. The central figure of 'Ein Heldenleben,' for all its fine qualities, is an inferior person compared, for instance, with Siegfried or Beethoven's idealised hero. At one time his enemies seem to be a pack of critics and journalists—which fact puts the whole conflict on a not very exalted plane. Subsequently, it transpires (from the fact that, 'The hero's works of peace' are Strauss' own creations) that the composer is himself the hero! Obviously, there is no reason why a work should not be autobiographical; but to dub oneself a hero is a trifle pretentious. 'Also sprach Zarathustra' is a rich, attractive score, but it is not really a musical revelation of philosophy. The 'Sinfonia Domestica' and the Alpine Symphony are intellectually and emotionally empty exhibitions of instrumental virtuosity. 'Der Rosenkavalier' is wealthy in seductive melody, brilliant in orchestral technique, and imbued with an instinct for writing Viennese waltz refrains, inferior only to those of Johann Strauss. Yet it also shows the composer's limitations. Apart from the trio for women's voices in the last act, which is a genuine expression of great lyrical beauty, the opera represents the acme of artificiality. It does not spring hot from his mind or out of the depths of his being. The emotions which it portrays are, for the most part, false ones—experienced, if at all, at second or third hand. It is not the music of life—of inward necessity,—but of an extremely efficient intellectual machine. Even 'Tod und Verklärung,' which one might expect to be a matter of life and death and which is indeed a masterpiece of atmosphere and of orchestral wizardry, does not reveal great profundity. The tale is well—nay, beautifully—told; but it is not deeply felt. Strauss does not usually get inside the skins of his characters in the way that Mozart and Wagner did with the persons of their operas. The one exception among the symphonic poems is 'Don Quixote,' which is, on the whole, his greatest work. The composer seems to have felt so much sympathy with the character of the mad, lovable knight, that he presents an

extraordinarily faithful and convincing portrait of him and describes his experiences with a charm and a humour which do not, as so often with Strauss, lie merely on the surface, but have their roots in a deeper humanity. The personality of Sancho Panza, too, is hit off most happily.

Delius is something more than a musical romanticist. There is in his art, in addition to the colour and the imagination which infuse it, a rare spiritual quality. I use the word 'rare' deliberately, because I believe that it is this rarity which has perhaps militated in the past against the ready acceptance of his music on the part of the larger musical public. The composer's own aversion from self-advertisement is not the only cause of the comparative obscurity in which so much of his art has been allowed to remain until fairly recently, and from which Sir Thomas Beecham's magnificent Delius festival and the activities of the B.B.C. rescued it. Delius' music does not, so to speak, go out to meet its listeners. It is, in many cases, reflective, profound, and subtle. Some have even criticised it on the ground that, apart from the glorious 'Mass of Life,' it is not positive enough to appeal to the majority of music lovers. But a 'Mass of Life' is so tremendous an exception that it is alone enough to make one suspicious of the whole theory, and it is not the only one. The 'Appalachia' variations afford another example of music which is pre-eminently definite in its strength and vigour, while the violin concerto is to a considerable extent rhapsodical in character. Even apart, however, from these great compositions, the work of Delius grows upon one more and more with further acquaintance. It has been accused of monotony: actually, there is tremendous variety in the methods with which a highly individual form of utterance is used, and the charge of sameness is due to imperfect acquaintance with a small number of his creations. But for our present purpose the important point to stress is that the art of Delius is essentially the music of life. It is the deeply felt expression of genuine experience. It is, moreover, plain to see, without being personally acquainted with the composer, that his work is the product of an extremely sensitive and imaginative nature. It is interesting to contrast it with that of Debussy. I am not going to suggest that Debussy's music is artificial: on the contrary,

it is as poetic and atmospheric in its own way as the art of Delius, but the way is quite different. Debussy's work, for all its shifting harmonies and indeterminate melodic lines, is crystal clear and immediately comprehensible now that his idiom is no longer unfamiliar: whereas with Delius we often have to think well and ponder deeply and listen repeatedly before we really absorb all that there is in it. Debussy's music, strange though it may seem to say so, is really obvious almost to the point of being superficial: now that we are accustomed to his method of speech, there is no more to be gleaned from listening to a work of his frequently than can be found at a single hearing; whereas with Delius, as with all the greatest masters, fresh beauties reveal themselves on each occasion that we return to one of his compositions. We need not tire of Debussy,—provided that we do not perform his works to excess—nor do I deny that his is the genuine music of life; but it is a life lived on the surface—a beautiful, delicate surface, no doubt, but none the less lacking in depth. The rich, profound experience which underlies the greatest works of Byrd, Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Brahms, and Delius, played no part in his artistic creations.

When we look round among the composers of to-day, we find, side by side with those who positively glory in the fact that their music is divorced from the rest of existence, a considerable number who write, as it is commonly said, 'from the heart' and who have made further contributions to the music of life. To mention a few of them, Sibelius, Bloch, Medtner, Vaughan-Williams, Holst, and Kodaly, alone are sufficient to negative the idea that this is merely, or even largely, an age of sound sensations. In their different ways, all these composers genuinely react to their experiences and convey them in their music. There is a rugged, uncompromising grandeur about the art of Sibelius which makes him one of the few really outstanding figures of the present century. This is markedly shown in the fourth and sixth symphonies, for instance, and in the austere, yet profound, utterances of 'Tapiola.' His violin concerto, which is far too seldom given but of which the B.B.C. with Arthur Catterall produced a notable performance earlier in the year, is one of the few great works

of modern times in this 'genre.' It contains not a superfluous bar, but is full of an emotional warmth spiritually akin to that of Brahms, to whom, however, he bears no outward resemblance whatever. It has been said that Medtner is a kind of Russian Brahms—a term which has no more significance than such phrases usually have. It is true that Medtner is more in the Teutonic than in the Russian tradition, and that in contrast with such men as Schönberg, Bartok, and von Webern, he speaks in an idiom which has long been familiar to us. But the musical thoughts which he conveys are intensely individual and genuine, and it is likely that those moving expressions of a modern romantic mind which are to be found in the finest of his songs and pianoforte compositions will survive long after a great many more startling productions of our more sensational contemporaries have been forgotten. Bloch is almost unique, because though there have been many Jewish composers before him, he is the only one who has completely and deliberately given voice to the Hebraic character and aspirations. His 'Israel' symphony is a profoundly felt and original work. The first section in its intensity somehow recalls Scriabin, but is more controlled than Scriabin's music usually is. It is fine, vigorous, imaginative stuff, using common chords more than the revolutionary modern school ever do, but frequently chromatic. There is in this music, for all its complexity of scoring, something stark, primitive, and impressive: while the slow middle section and the soft ending to the symphony possess a spiritual, devotional character which is not too often found in twentieth-century music. This is not, on the whole, an age of religious art in any form, and when, therefore, we meet music like this of Bloch, or the noble 'Psalmus Hungaricus' of Kodaly, or Holst's 'Hymn of Jesus,' or the 'Mass in G minor' and 'Sancta Civitas' of Vaughan-Williams—all in their various styles giving utterance to deeply religious conviction,—the impression made is all the stronger, if only by contrast with the character of most of the compositions produced by our contemporaries.

Side by side with this music of life, however, we have the strange, inhuman creations of such men as Stravinsky, Bartok, Schönberg, and his followers. Stravinsky is an easy case to understand. He is not a genius, but a brilliant

and accomplished person who is capable of writing in a variety of styles and has taken delight in doing so : none of them is peculiar to him, and each one is adopted apparently as a kind of 'tour de force.' He never writes from deep inward conviction and seems, in fact, positively to glory in the objectivity of his art. He passes from the rich glamour of fairyland, exemplified in 'The Firebird,' which was strongly influenced by Rimsky-Korsakov, to the grotesque wizardry of 'Petrouchka,' and thence to the primitive sensationalism of 'Le Sacre du Printemps.' After this and 'Les Noces,' which is an exhilarating conglomeration of violent rhythms, he switches across to the mock-antiquity of 'Pulcinella,' the pale colours of 'Apollo Musagetes,' and the quasi-classicism of the piano concerto and 'Œdipus Rex.' He is almost everything in turn and nothing long. I say 'almost everything,' because he is never himself. At the end of it all, we have no more idea of the mind of the composer than we had at the beginning. He is like an ancient Athenian actor who wore a succession of masks for the different parts which he played and never revealed his own face to the audience. Stravinsky's art, then, is the very antithesis of the music of life. It is the music of unreality, of sensationalism, of magic and conjuring tricks, or of sheer design and pattern.

Schönberg is a stranger case. It would never have come natural to Stravinsky to express himself or any human emotions in his work, but to Schönberg originally it was instinctive to do so, and in his earlier works—'Verklärte Nacht,' the string quartet (Opus 7), and 'Gürrelieder'—he wrote warm, human music in a somewhat Wagnerian idiom. But precisely because he felt that he would never be able to develop a line of his own along that path he deliberately turned his back on it, and with 'Pierrot Lunaire' (1912), and all his works composed since that date, he has, as it would appear, goaded himself, in a way contrary to his natural romantic impulses, into the creation of inhuman music in a polytonal or atonal style. It is, moreover, this direction of his activities which has influenced his disciples, von Webern and Berg. Now, I am not going to declare that this music has no value, but I venture to suggest that its worth is entirely scientific or historical. These men have

made, and are making, interesting experiments not only with the possibilities of instrumental timbres, but with the potentialities of new contrapuntal and harmonic combinations. They are not musicians of great accomplishment themselves, but it is quite likely that a genius may arise who will be able to profit by the investigations and discoveries of these pioneers of the early twentieth century. Many of their inventions will no doubt be discarded by him, but others will probably prove to be of great utility. Nevertheless, the creations of Schönberg, from 'Pierrot Lunaire' onwards, and of his followers, are of no æsthetic moment in themselves. They are admired by a small band of devoted adherents, but the mass of musical opinion is repelled by them. 'Pierrot Lunaire'—which is not, after all, a recent work, and which therefore might reasonably be expected to make an appeal by now (eighteen years after its creation) if it were ever going to do so—created much the same impression when it was revived recently by the B.B.C. as it did when it was first produced. It is a clever expression of lunacy—the composer apparently realising that the best way to portray madness in tones is to write crazy music. There is, also, a great deal of bitterness in it. Generally, it may be described as an interesting, if rather distressing, experiment, but so far removed from the lives of ordinary men and women that it is unlikely ever to win wide acceptance. The suite for pianoforte written in 1925, which Steuermann introduced to us at the same concert of the B.B.C., is really all fake: Schönberg is just seeing what can be done by writing keyless music for a keyed instrument, and the result is mere cacophony, with no mind, and no soul, behind it. The snag about this composer's 'Volte face' was that in making it he was not following his natural instincts or the dictates of his musical imagination, but was, by a cold and calculated effort of will, withdrawing from the path of romanticism and setting himself on the road of scientific research. His theories do not work out in practice, and his deficiency of rhythmic sense—in which he presents a strong contrast to Stravinsky—results in his music appearing singularly nerveless and contributes in no small measure to its remoteness from life. Bartok, like Schönberg, is a pioneer experimenting with fresh tonal combinations, and the

absence of emotion from his music also seems to divorce it from genuine experience : but he has a strong gift of rhythm which brings it nearer to the heart-beat and the throb of the pulse and thus gives it a closer affinity to the music of life than the recent works of Schönberg can ever bear.

The true ground of complaint against the so-called revolutionary composers of the present day, then, is not that their works are ugly : for ugliness, especially since Berlioz and Wagner showed the way to elaborate musical characterisation, is sometimes appropriate : it would not have done, for instance, for Berlioz to paint the 'March to the Scaffold' or the 'Ride to the Abyss' in pretty colours, or for Wagner to portray the hate of Alberich or the motive of vengeance in 'Die Götterdämmerung' by means of themes which were beautiful. The case against the modern musical bogey-men is that in many cases they do not write from the heart, and that, though they may make useful experiments, there is a risk also of their throwing up a great deal of mere rubbish, which only passes muster even for a short while because the very strangeness of its idiom covers up its emotional and intellectual vacuity. There is probably more charlatanry in the world of music to-day than at any previous period in the history of the art, but the best grounds of hope for the future are these : that there is at last a growing appreciation of the art of Delius, the greatest and most spiritual musical genius since Brahms ; that men like Medtner and Sibelius are still actively engaged in composition ; and that there are in England at least two musicians of great promise who have youth on their side and who are genuine creative artists and not merely 'intellectuals.' I refer to Constant Lambert, whose imaginative and sensitive setting of 'The Rio Grande' has made such a deep impression, and William Walton, the brilliant and inspired composer of 'Façade,' the 'Portsmouth Point' overture, and the 'Sinfonia Concertante' for pianoforte and orchestra. The music of life continues to be written, and, so long as this is the case, there will always be life in music.

R. W. S. MENDL.

Art. 4.—THE REPORT OF THE INDIAN STATUTORY COMMISSION AND ITS CRITICS.

SINCE the publication of the Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Englishmen of all ranks and all shades of opinion have been stimulated into taking a lively interest in Indian affairs and Indian history uncharacteristic of previous generations. The general public in England as a consequence have already been provided with a formidable amount of material on the subject, of varying worth, with which to satisfy this newly-evincing curiosity. If the supply of literature of such a nature is any indication of the demand it may well be inferred that at the present time a competent knowledge of the Indian problem is very widespread. It is not proposed, therefore, in these paragraphs to travel over the same ground which must have been well explored already. Their purpose is rather an attempt to deal with those critics who have elected to sit in judgment upon the Report and who appear to believe that they are better qualified than any Commission to lead their fellow-countrymen by the waters of comfort. The Report must be judged not only on whatever merits it may itself possess but also in the light of any alternative suggestions that have emanated from authoritative quarters. Hitherto, these have been chiefly remarkable for their intangibility and disregard of fundamental realities. The critical faculty in the majority of Indian leaders of opinion seems to be more highly developed than the constructive. For nearly three years the Commissioners have subjected to a winnowing process whatever alternative suggestions have been submitted or have been made available to them, and they are quite prepared, when and if occasion arises, to demonstrate how little these are designed to solve India's difficulties.

It is not suggested for one moment that the recommendations published in the second volume of the Report could not be improved upon, or that there is not a considerable amount of essential detail to be filled in. The Commissioners could surely not be expected to do more than present a broad, general outline when their avowed purpose was to provide a form of constitution which, it was hoped, would be capable of being adapted to no less

than eight Provinces with such varying conditions and circumstances as these present. But it can be legitimately inferred that those who are now advocating alternative solutions of this baffling constitutional problem, some more reactionary, others more revolutionary than that of the Commission, have failed to appreciate all its implications, and that if they will come to closer grips with their subject, they will find themselves confronted with difficulties which they little anticipated, to judge by the serene and visionary optimism which their suggestions obviously betray.

The Conference at St James's Palace will doubtless afford an opportunity for those who seem so solicitous to avoid any invidious comparison of their own schemes with that advocated by Sir John Simon and his colleagues, to submit them to be investigated by a tribunal which, whatever else may be said about it, will not be lacking in diversity of race, religion, and political interests. The dispute as to whether or not the Report of the Royal Statutory Commission should form the basis of the deliberations of that Conference seems to have left out of account the fact that the setting up of the Conference was the suggestion of the Commission itself. It remains to be discovered whether, amid the multiplicity of counsel which it is likely to provide, authority will ultimately take refuge in any of the Commission's recommendations.

As was to be expected, some critics have accused the Commission of being reactionary; others, less clamorous perhaps, have accused them of being revolutionary. A third body of critics, evidently not taking any chances, accuse them of erring against the light in both these respects. Apart from the obvious consideration that such mutually destructive criticisms cancel one another, it might legitimately be concluded from their diversity that Sir John Simon and his colleagues have steered the safer course. As to those who accuse the Report of being reactionary, it is difficult to discover what intelligible justification there is in that accusation. The famous pronouncement of August 1919, forms the basis of the terms of reference. No one can say that the conclusions at which the Commissioners arrived, after scrupulous investigation of all the evidence, were inconsistent with this pronouncement. As a whole their

recommendations are manifestly progressive. A Federal Government making for a United India, provincial autonomy, widening of the franchise, maintenance of the rates of Indianisation in the Services, to mention only a few of their most fundamental proposals, clearly bear this contention out. Those who are apprehensive that the suggested rate of progress is not swift enough must be blind to or ignorant of the uncompromising obstacles which hinder progress at a more rapid pace—external and internal defence, communal dissensions, the heterogeneous nature of this vast sub-continent, and the unsophisticated character of the majority of its population.

To those who accuse the Commission of being revolutionary I would reply that for more than half a century there has been an undertaking implicit in every pronouncement, be it from the Throne itself, from successive Viceroys, or from the Front Government Bench, that there should be a continuing and progressive advance towards self-government in India. This solemn undertaking manifestly can only be implemented by taking risks which the old-fashioned official in India—I am casting no aspersions upon him—would probably regard as disastrous. To those who accuse the Commission of being both revolutionary and reactionary, by alleging that the suggested rate of progress is too expeditious at the circumference and too sluggish at the centre, it must be indicated that as far as the centre is concerned the recommendations call not so much for a reactionary as for a different form of government necessitated both by the inclusion of the Indian States and also by the grant of provincial autonomy. It is true that indirect election is substituted for direct election at the centre, and it may be that some authorities regard indirect election as in essence reactionary. The fact that the Commission favoured indirect election to the centre does not necessarily argue that the average Indian is not qualified to use the vote intelligently—on the contrary, ample testimony is borne to his capacity in this respect by increasing the system of direct election in the Provinces and widening the franchise—but it was considered that the circumstances of India rendered federal government at the centre inevitable, and that on this assumption the most convenient method of electing members to a central federal

government would be by indirect election from the Provinces.

It was quite obvious to the Commissioners when they were compiling their Report where the main attack would be launched, and in this respect there was no miscalculation. It was both on the recommendation with regard to the Central Government and on that with regard to the defence of India that their assailants concentrated the hottest fire, and it is therefore at these two points that a reply is most called for with all the available weight of argument. In offering a justification for their treatment of the Central Government it is only fair, in the first instance, to state that here was a problem in which the Commissioners did not have much assistance rendered to them by any of the witnesses who gave evidence in India. True, there was consistently a vague demand for a strong Central Government, but supplementary questions nowhere elicited any very helpful suggestions or even an explanation as to what the expression 'strong central government' signified. In the 'All Parties Conference' Report it is made obvious that its authors are obsessed with the idea that nothing but a Parliament directly and exclusively modelled upon the British precedent is appropriate for India. It is contended by them that every country in Europe which has turned its back on autocracy, and even Oriental nations like Japan, Turkey, and Persia, have adopted constitutions according to our model. But do these particular nations in reality constitute a perfect analogy? Can a justifiable comparison be instituted between existing Indian conditions and those obtaining in England or in France? Must we not rather turn for the most appropriate illustration to those countries which in the first instance consisted of a congeries of separate states, such as America, Australia, Canada, and Germany, and which subsequently entered into a federation? Even these examples cannot be said to serve the purpose in all essentials. In any case a very superficial examination of the circumstances of India must prove the fallacy of adopting the British parliamentary model at the centre of an Indian Federation. The Commissioners have set out very fully in their Report the reasons why they consider that a legislature founded upon the House of Commons would be quite impracticable.

While advocating the establishment of some form of dyarchy at the centre, which for various stated reasons the authors of the Statutory Commission Report condemn, the 'All Parties Conference' reached the decision that the Legislative Assembly should consist of 500 members. Hypothecating adult suffrage, this gives a representation of one member to every 240,000 of the electors. This fantastic result alone would seem to stultify their suggested Central Government as a faithful representation of British parliamentary government in India. But there is an objection of a much more fundamental character than one merely of the unwieldiness of constituencies to such a form of Central Government. The dominant motive which has guided the recommendation of the Commission has been the desire to bring about a United India. No one can maintain that the Congress Leaders' proposal tends in that direction. On the other hand, the Commission's conception of a federal constitution is in all likelihood better calculated than any other yet examined to achieve the ultimate goal of a United India.

In July of this year Mr Sastri, one of India's most distinguished sons, in the course of a lecture delivered to a number of Members of the House of Commons, made the deliberate statement that one of his main objections to the recommendations of the Commission was that he wholly disagreed with the federal idea, and further committed himself to the remarkable observation that in no quarter of India had it found any favour. Apart from the fact that the Princes have jointly given expression to the opinion that the ultimate solution of the Indian problem, whenever circumstances are favourable and the time is ripe, is federation, the 'All Parties Conference' Report itself recommends a similar expedient as the ultimate and most satisfactory solution. In Chapter V of their report, a chapter written with the same commendable restraint and ability as the rest of the document, it is made perfectly clear that the ultimate goal for India is a federation of some description. While stating that if the constitution in India is to be a federal one, 'as we think it might well be,' the authors seem to arrive at the conclusion that the position of the Indian States in relation to that federation 'calls for a definite determination.' On this hypothesis they proceed to commit

themselves to the extent that if the Indian States would be willing to join such a federation, the authors would heartily welcome such a decision. 'We hope and trust that in the light of experience gained the Indian States may make up their mind to join formally an Indian federation.'

While recording their opinion that until the Indian States have reached the decision to join the federation, British India must not be denied responsible government or dominion status, they recommend that Indian federation, compatible as it will be with a maximum degree of autonomy in the local communities, whether Princes or States, can be the only solid foundation for responsible government. Even if what is contemplated in the Nehru Report is a Federation between British India and the States, excluding any idea of the Provinces as units of a Federation, its authors obviously do not reject federation as an essential feature of their scheme. How can Mr Sastri claim, in the light of this evidence, that in no quarter is a form of federal government advocated? The wish with him must have been father to the thought. It was as the advocate of the British model that he made the statement. If, however, the feasibility of federation is once admitted, even he must be constrained to acknowledge that the form of Central Government as it exists in India to-day becomes anomalous and inappropriate.

There is no question but that the Indian States present a problem of acute difficulty which has not failed to give even the Congress Leaders abundant food for reflection. Again let us turn to the pages of the 'All Parties Conference' Report, where the unity of interests between the States and British India is very fairly dealt with, and we find the following suggestion volunteered: 'Indeed, if ever there was a case for a round-table conference at which a perfect understanding could easily be reached it was this.' While the signatories of the Statutory Commission Report do not share this facile optimism with regard to the outcome of such an experiment—Indian constitutionalists always find these problems so easy—and would in fact have considered it a breach of their trust if they had represented this or any other feature of the case as easy of solution, they were the first to recommend that the problem of the States should be

thrashed out at a round-table conference. It must be noted in this connection that the authors of the 'All Parties Conference' Report admit that they have not had the advantage of a discussion with representatives of the Indian Princes. Doubtless, if they had been able to profit by any such deliberations, they might have been brought to realise that the problem is not so easy as they had at first imagined.

The second principle comprised in the Commission's recommendations for the Central Government is that it must be composed of representatives of the Provincial Legislatures to which members should be responsible rather than to constituencies of unwieldy proportions. As is pointed out in the report, where the present system fails lamentably is that there is no nexus between the two categories of public representation. It is essential to the smooth working of the Central Government of so large a country as India that the diversity of provincial needs and opinions should find real expression in the Central Legislature. If the British House of Commons is taken as a model it is difficult to understand how such a result is to be obtained.

But there is another consideration which has been completely lost sight of by the critics, and which prompted the Commission to suggest indirect elections to the Centre. It is only by this means that a plan for making available further sources of revenue for provincial purposes can be made to function. The taxation suggested to be levied for the benefit of the Provinces will only be imposed on the recommendation of a council consisting of the provincial finance ministers. The ultimate responsibility for imposing it will rest with the newly constituted Assembly. As the Central Government under this scheme will only have a very remote interest in the proceeds, a complete divorce between responsibility for taxation and responsibility for expenditure would inevitably result unless the Central Assembly were directly representative of the Provincial Legislatures. But it is not surprising that our critics have ignored this all-important side of the question. Incredible as it may seem, from the beginning to the end of the 'All Parties Conference' Report not one hint of a suggestion as to how India's finances are to be conducted is vouchsafed to us. The

financial problem—by no means the least perplexing in the institution of self-government—does not perturb, hardly seems to concern the Congress Leaders.

As to the second main objective of their critics' attack—the recommendations which the Commissioners have made on the subject of defence. Of all the criticisms which have been levelled at the Report, the strictures passed upon the suggestions contained therein with regard to the defence of India are perhaps the most unwarrantable. The Commission has definitely ranged itself against that particular school of thought which dismisses the whole subject with the reflection that the needs of India's defence constitute and must always constitute an irremovable obstacle in the way of the ultimate attainment of the purpose avowed in the declaration of Aug. 20, 1917. It is certainly true that in the Report care has been taken—as was essential—to lay emphasis upon the unique aspects of the defence question. It was a bounden duty to record the conclusion that the problem of defence was one of the most stubborn impediments to the granting of self-government within a reasonable period of time. That conclusion was arrived at, it is hardly necessary to point out, not based upon any technical military knowledge which any of the Commissioners might have individually possessed, but from the evidence and advice tendered by the best military experts both in India and in England. The conclusions, moreover, in a report of this nature must obviously bear some relation to the opinions and information submitted. On this point all the expert evidence was absolutely agreed. But while the Commission felt it to be their duty to warn both Indians and Englishmen of this most crucial difficulty, they have spared no effort to discover some means of circumventing so formidable an obstacle. They have examined all the alternative suggestions and they find that there is none which would not expose India to the gravest peril or which would be better calculated to make the path of progress smooth. All experts are agreed that the creation of a purely Indian army must in the nature of things be a lengthy process. But the Commissioners did not, as indeed they might have done, take refuge behind this irrefutable fact. On the contrary, they have come deliberately to the conclusion that it is not expedient to

wait for this process to be completed without giving to India an opportunity to take its proper place in the Commonwealth of nations within the Empire before that process is complete. And yet they are accused of exploiting this dilemma as an excuse for procrastination. Nothing could be a better measure of the disingenuous character of the criticisms to which they have been subjected than such an indictment. But not content with this animadversion the Congress Leaders stigmatise the warnings and recommendations of the Commission as insulting and derogatory to the dignity of India.

How can they be characterised as an insult to India? Would it be an insult to an English Sandhurst cadet to tell him that he would not be qualified to command a regiment as soon as he had passed out from Sandhurst? Why should it be any more of an insult to an Indian cadet to tell him anything so obvious? Did not the Sheen Committee itself, largely composed of Indians by the way, insist that 'progress . . . must be contingent upon success being secured at each stage and upon military efficiency being maintained throughout'? With the best intentions in the world, can an efficient army be improvised of raw material in one night? Is it, moreover, an insult to India to say that British troops are still needed for internal security? If so, Indians are themselves constantly placing a strain upon their own *amour propre* by admitting this necessity in the most practical manner.

In certain quarters it has been urged that risks should be taken. In all fairness it must be admitted that the Commissioners have done so in many other directions if their recommendations are accepted; but the risk of handing over the defence of India immediately to a minister responsible to a legislature, a course which has never been adopted with imperial troops in any of our Dependencies, with a vague hope that the Indianisation of the army would prove a much shorter and much simpler process than any military expert has advised, would be a risk which the Imperial Parliament would not be justified in running. This is a matter which concerns not India alone, but the whole Empire.

If we turn to the 'All Parties Conference' for guidance on the question of defence, there is nothing whatever to assist us in the main body of the Report beyond a

totally irrelevant recommendation for a committee of defence, which in itself betrays considerable confusion of thought. It is true that in the introductory remarks there are some very vague references to the problem of the army—presumably the Indian Army and not the British Army in India, although to one studying the subject for the first time this would be left in doubt. There is not one word stated as to whether the latter should remain to garrison the country or not. There is a quotation from Sir Sivaswamy Iyer, described as 'a gentleman who has made a special study of the army in India,' and who argues entirely on the analogy that none of the Colonies was in a position to assume its defence at the time when a self-governing constitution was granted, an analogy so patently false that I am afraid this gentleman's special study of the army in India has not hitherto proved of much avail.

It is the legitimate complaint of the Commission that none of their critics has gone deeply into these problems. It is easy enough to turn the tables upon them if we subject their recommendations to the light of even the most superficial investigation. As an example of their light-hearted, one might almost say light-headed, way of treating the graver problems inherent in this question, let us take the one and only sentence in the Nehru Report which deals with the North-West Frontier problem. 'Regarding the form of government in the North-West Frontier Province and in Beluchistan,' it runs, 'we are of opinion that the status of these areas must be made the same as that of other provinces. We cannot in justice or in logic deny the right of any part of India to participate in responsible government.' That is all the report has to say on this complex problem. It surely might be said in justice and in logic that it is high time the Pundits should set to work and study this problem in all its complexities and, if possible, on the spot. There is no single authority, either British or Indian, during the last fifty years who is not of the opinion that the tracts and the districts form one organic whole which can only be properly managed if both parts are in the hands of one centralising and controlling authority on the frontier itself, a fact which alone renders differentiation of treatment in this area essential. This conclusion was reached

by the majority of the Bray Committee—forced on them 'by the sheer process of reasoning,' a process which does not seem to have commended itself to the Congress Leaders, if their suggestion is to be taken at its face value.

To make the matter clear to those who are unfamiliar with its complexities a certain amount of repetition of the information with which the Commission has supplied the public is essential. The first point to be insisted upon is that nobody has ever suggested, not even the Congress Leaders, that any proposed legislature of the North-West Frontier Province should have jurisdiction over the whole tribal area as well as over the five administered Districts. But the supremely important charge of the administration of justice and the preservation of order in the five Districts is inextricably connected with the same charge in the tribal tracts, which it is admitted on all hands must remain directly under the Government of India. The tribesmen have domestic interests on both sides of the line. It is essential, therefore, that there must be the closest co-operation between the police in the Districts and the Political Agencies, which can only be secured by their being under one co-ordinating authority. The second point to be noted is that the financial burden of policing the Districts is immense. If any difficulty arose on this head and the matter was dealt with by a Provincial Legislature, reference, with all its attendant delays, would have to be made to the Government of India, when the smooth and rapid working of administration in an area exposed constantly to the danger of tribal raids is so essential. The third point to be insisted upon is that behind the civil organisation recourse has to be made to the military. If troops have to be called for it is imperative that the request for them should come from a single source as the result of a co-ordinated plan. But there is a final and still more vital consideration which by itself renders the casual observation of the Nehru Report on the North-West Frontier abortive. On the other side of the Durand line is the Sovereign State of Afghanistan, ethnologically closely related to the tribesmen of the Frontier. The question of law and order which in other Provinces is a domestic and internal matter here is closely related to foreign policy and to imperial defence, both an all India and even a British Empire concern which

cannot be left to a local legislature. In view of all these incontrovertible facts it would have been contrary to the best interests of India itself for the Commission to have made any other recommendation than that which they have submitted on this subject to the Imperial Parliament.

Every one must sympathise with the aspirations of the more enlightened section of the population dwelling in this area, but for the present and under existing circumstances it is impossible for the head to grant that which the heart desires. It is quite evident that the 'All Parties Conference' in making such a complacent suggestion merely did so as a sop to Moslem feelings. It was certainly not dictated by Hindu predilections. On the contrary an influential body of Hindus in their evidence before the Royal Commission begged that there might be no weakening of the Executive in the North-West Frontier Province. How can it possibly be urged that this area should be treated precisely the same as the remaining Provinces, which are confronted with no such problems? This method of disposing of a matter so grave and complicated surely can almost be characterised as frivolous. The great Indian jurist who is presumably responsible for the report hardly does himself justice in lending his authority to a recommendation so inconsistent with statesmanship or common sense. The Congress Leaders' treatment of this particular example of the numerous Indian constitutional problems which engaged the attention of the Commission at every turn in their laborious task has been dwelt on at some length because it serves as a typical instance of how utterly their severest critics have failed to appreciate the immensity and the complexity of the issues at stake.

In India the issues are so incalculable that it is merely futile to base an argument for immediate and complete self-government upon a comparison with any other dominion within the British Empire. As was only to be anticipated, the opponents of reform by easy stages have not been slow to seize upon those provisions, commonly known as safeguards, which the Commissioners have thought fit to insert into the framework of their scheme in order to maintain the basic conditions of security and the fundamentals of government. It was an obvious criticism to advance that we were taking away

with one hand what we were giving with the other. But the indictment is more plausible than valid. It is persistently argued that in the case of no other dependency in the British Commonwealth of Nations was the gift of a constitution so hedged round with conditional clauses—but this is to forget that in no other dependency was there ever at any time such formidable obstacles to be surmounted or such grave risks to be incurred. A novel constitutional experiment tried out in Australia, for example, might, if it proved a failure, have been temporarily inconvenient and embarrassing to those immediately concerned. If the experiment failed to function satisfactorily the consequences of its deficiency might be serious but not irreparable, nor would such a failure necessarily produce any very powerful reactions in any other part of the Empire. But a constitutional experiment that failed in India might prove to be, in its consequences, nothing short of catastrophic and might have its repercussions not only in India, not only in the Empire, but even in the remotest quarters of the globe. It seemed, therefore, absolutely incumbent upon the Commissioners to suggest a provision that during the transitional stages from dyarchy to autonomy there must be left residing in the Viceroy and the Governors of Provinces certain extra-ordinary powers in the event of a breakdown of the constitutional machinery or in the event of co-operation in the work of government being entirely withheld. But it must be clearly appreciated by students of this problem that safeguards are necessary not only or even especially because, since the Reforms were instituted, there have arisen Indian leaders hostile to the British Raj who demand to be trusted and in the same breath threaten to paralyse all the institutions of government. Even if all those who lead political opinion in India were entirely well disposed and ready to give of their best efforts towards a peaceful and successful working of the constitution, safeguards would still be indispensable. Experiments of a comprehensive character and of a very hazardous nature are being put to the test in a country whose population, broadly speaking, is quite unfamiliar either by tradition or experience with the particular methods that these experiments involve. A young engineer passing through a course of instruction

being suddenly invited to manipulate a complicated machine by himself, however careful and conscientious he may be, must surely have some one of experience watching by his side ready to take over control in case of a mistake which, however venial, might prove disastrous both to the machine and to the operator. It was such a consideration as this which influenced the Commissioners to write: 'While we are prepared to recommend a considerable advance towards self-government, and while we believe that a sense of responsibility can only be taught by making men responsible for the effects of their own actions, we desire to secure that experience is not bought too dearly. There must be in India a power which can step in and save the situation before it is too late.'

It is quite true that many of the Indian political leaders are statesmen of the highest order and the widest experience, men who have served the State long and well enough to qualify them for the most responsible posts in the executive or the administration. Doubtless, too, there are many as yet untried hands of equal ability although not of equal experience, who will prove in days to come that there is nothing to be feared from the Indianisation of the Services, provided they will consent to pass through a period of probation which, in view of the great responsibilities incidental to their trust, must be a protracted one. That there will ultimately be no shortage of Indians who are capable of shouldering the great burden of responsibility which will be theirs when the final stage of self-government is reached, there can be no doubt. But at present for the British Government there is one over-riding obligation which excludes any idea of prematurely dispensing with safeguards. Even if it is true to say that India has a full complement of capable statesmen at one end of the social scale, it must not be forgotten that of the 247,000,000 who inhabit British India there are at least 220,000,000 who little reckon of the great changes which are evolving in the body politic of their native land, who are completely ignorant of the men and the events that are making Indian history to-day, and who are living even unto this hour in a condition which Mr Montagu described as one of 'pathetic contentment.' Whether the word 'contentment' is truly applicable to their condition or not, those who have travelled widely in

India and have seen something of village life and the village inhabitants mostly living on the margin of subsistence, a prey to disease and occasionally to famine and heirs to all the other ills of the flesh, must be permitted to doubt; but what is not open to any uncertainty is that the British Government is in the position of trustee in relation to these inarticulate millions. It may be the wise, the only course to rouse them from their present conditions of existence; but if we set about attempting to alter their lot through the medium of a far-reaching constitutional experiment, it must be absolutely implicit in this onerous trusteeship that those responsible for the order, safety, and tranquillity of the realm should see to it that these helpless millions entrusted to their care shall not exchange their present lot, be it one of contentment or the opposite, for something worse. This might well be the result of interference if the experiment were not subject to the timely operation of safeguards. While believing and hoping, therefore, that progressive self-government will bring with it, *pari passu*, a progressive improvement in the lot of the Indian populations, we must provide that safeguards shall be introduced into those parts of the machinery upon the smooth working of which all else depends.

Apart from these conclusions it can be taken for granted that these extra-ordinary powers will be exercised by those with whom they are entrusted only for specified and limited purposes. It is quite unthinkable that such autocratic powers would be exercised capriciously or contrary to the best interests or even contrary to the real predilections of the vast majority of Indian subjects, although their employment under any set of circumstances would no doubt arouse clamorous protests from those who are rather playing a political game in their own interests than acting upon any altruistic impulse. Moreover, it must be remembered that it is just on account of the existence of these safeguards that we should be able to take much graver risks, to embark upon much bolder experiments, and to take much longer strides towards self-government than if there were no provision made in the event of a serious breakdown.

Finally, it is interesting to recall that the most reliable authorities, both Indian and English, whose opinion was

of any value and who gave the Commission the benefit of their advice, especially those Indians in the Provinces who had actually experienced the responsibilities of administration, were emphatic that safeguards must be maintained, although it should be admitted that they were not invariably categorical as to what particular and definite form safeguards should take.

As to any other important aspects of the problem, it goes without saying that one of the greatest difficulties confronting those who aspire to make some contribution towards an ultimate solution is the antagonism, much too lightly disposed of by many political writers, that exists between the two major Indian communities. The Commissioners went out to India only too anxious to modify, in the light of their own experience, any pre-conceived views derived from second-hand information on this subject. But facts were overwhelming. No one can form any conception of what a dominating and devastating influence this rivalry exercises upon the general situation until they have visited those Provinces where the tension between Moslem and Hindu is most acute. It is this abiding irreconcilability which has induced Sir John Simon and his colleagues, just as it persuaded Lord Chelmsford and Mr Montagu, to make a recommendation which is obviously quite inconsistent with basic democratic ideas and, be it said, quite contrary to their own predilections, namely, the continuance of separate electorates. It is impossible to over-estimate the acute tension between these two communities, and the resulting difficulties in evolving a constitution which could prove satisfactory to both. Nor is it only the Indian Statutory Commission that has found this a problem difficult to negotiate. The so-called 'All Parties Conference' split upon the self-same rock. It was this identical obstruction which rendered their report nugatory. Again, it was the baneful influence of communal tension which resulted in certain members of the Indian Central Committee publishing dissentient minutes which were well-nigh as long as the original report itself. If ever any Indian statesman was capable of composing the differences of the two communities it was Mr Jinnah, one of the few Moslems of ability or distinction in the Congress. In spite of all his strenuous efforts to compose

these differences he ultimately found himself, not in the position of one who leads his party, but as one who is led, and the intriguing spectacle was witnessed, soon after the publication of the Nehru Report, of Mr Jinnah embracing Sir Mahommed Shafi in public.

What is the root cause of the trouble between Moslem and Hindu? There is no perfect analogy to this phenomenon that I am aware of to be found in any part of the world or in any period of history. When it was sufficiently obvious that the Reforms had come to stay in India the Moslems became apprehensive that the Hindus, owing to their superiority both of education and of numbers, would inevitably appropriate the lion's share of all positions of responsibility and power, that the ancient rivalries, which, far from being set at rest, would be exacerbated by the emergence of political consciousness in India, and that the inevitable result would be, not a democratic form of government in which each of the communities would have appropriate representation in view of their political importance, but, what they feared most, a Brahmin oligarchy. The Hindu, on the other hand, conscious as he is of his intellectual and numerical superiority, is also aware of the physical strength of the Moslem race, which contrasts very favourably with his own. With the exception of the Sikhs and the Ghorkas, the latter being not Indian subjects at all, the fighting forces of India are mainly drawn from the Moslem community. This circumstance is the only effective brake upon the ambition of the Hindus to gain complete political control of India.

There is one other consideration to be borne in mind while examining this part of the problem. I have seen an analogy attempted to be drawn between the rivalry of the Roman Catholics and Protestants in Great Britain, and particularly the rivalry between the Ulster Protestants and the Roman Catholics of the south of Ireland—a perfectly fallacious and misleading comparison. It must be remembered that Roman Catholics and Protestants are of the same creed. Broadly speaking, although not of identically the same ancestry, often enough there is little to distinguish them in physical characteristics to-day. Roman Catholic and Protestant frequently intermarry. They all speak the same language, they all

live the same lives, socially and in every other way. Moslem and Hindu, on the other hand, for the most part belong to utterly different races, although a certain proportion of contemporary Moslems are descended from converted Hindus. There is no intermarriage whatever; their respective religions represent utterly different creeds. They live different and separate lives. It is difficult to imagine what binding force can ever bring the two communities together and make them one and indivisible. Optimists conceive that they will ultimately fuse through the medium of some mysterious political process. But it is the very despair of all well-wishers of India that up to the present whatever process of this character may be in operation seems to have had exactly the reverse effect. Incidentally, nothing could have been more calculated to produce the desired result, nothing could have won the present Viceroy so great a measure of prestige as his sincere appeal to the Moslems and Hindus which he made upon his first arrival in the country. But it has to be acknowledged that no appreciable effect can hitherto be detected. It would certainly be far the most expeditious step towards self-government if these two major communities could make peace and a period be set to this barren struggle; but whether such a compact could ever be more than a working agreement, an armed neutrality, it would need a bold man to prophesy.

Apart from the specific points upon which the Report of the Indian Statutory Commission has been assailed there are certain broad general criticisms which have been spoken and written both in England and India. Many of those whose haste to denounce the Report of the Royal Commission root and branch was in inverse ratio to their own importance, on the morning that the Report was issued hurled invectives from their editorial or professorial chairs without any attempt to master the contents or to produce in reply any reasoned or reasonable arguments which could have made a valuable contribution towards the general discussion of a problem that requires from the student the most assiduous attention. This type of commentator can obviously be ignored. I will address myself rather to those general criticisms which were made by responsible Indian leaders and others after they had evidently had time to study and to give

their best attention to the recommendations. Mr Sastri, one of the ablest of all the Indian critics and whose word compels the utmost respect, while admitting that there was a great deal of value in the Report, complained that it bore no relation to the Viceroy's statement of November, and that the words 'dominion status' were not mentioned from one end to the other. With regard to the Viceroy's speech, however politic it might have been and however calculated to promote good feeling between the two peoples, there was no sort of obligation upon the Commissioners to connect any part of their Report with the expressions contained in that speech. They already had their terms of reference given to them by the King-Emperor acting through and with the consent of the Imperial Parliament, and had contented themselves, as was right and fitting, with reporting on these and upon these alone. The expression 'dominion status' was judiciously avoided. The Commissioners had it made plain to them that India has been too much the victim of catch-phrases and generalisations throughout its constitutional history, and therefore they believed that they would be serving a more useful purpose if, instead of employing indefinite phrases, which only serve to confuse or mislead, they endeavoured to be consistently explicit. The drawing of fine distinctions between the precise significance of such abstract expressions as 'responsible government' and 'dominion status' seems to be altogether begging the question. Whether you call the ultimate form of the constitution 'responsible government,' 'dominion status,' or employ any other term, the gist of the matter is not in phraseology, but rather in the rate of progress towards the desired goal and the method of its ultimate achievement.

It has been said that the Report lacks imagination. The bounden duty of pointing out to Indians and Englishmen, and to the rest of the world, the hard, bitter realities of the situation was too obvious, too insistent, to admit of the Commissioners making any incursion into the realm of imagination. It may well be argued that imagination had already played too prominent a part in Indian affairs. Appeals to sentiment have too often diverted men's thoughts from seeking after the truth: they lead nowhere. Not until those who influence

political thought in India consent to acknowledge the compelling necessities of the situation, and to act accordingly with patience, moderation, and restraint, can any substantial progress be made towards self-government. It is futile for those who now have charge of India's destinies to imagine that, by breathing some mystical formula over the sea of troubles upon which the Indian ship of state is being storm-tossed, calm will be restored. Such a miracle is not given to man to perform. There is no supernatural essence in such a phrase as 'dominion status,' and to believe that by repeating it often enough we shall find ourselves in smoother waters is to indulge a vain superstition.

What is far more serviceable for our present needs than any faith in a talisman is that the leaders of opinion both in England and in India should, in a spirit of goodwill and mutual forbearance, recognise and suit their actions to unpalatable facts, that the two peoples should drop this attitude of mutual distrust and suspicion which never ought to have obtained between those who owe so much one to the other. It is deplorable that, where there is so much latent goodwill on both sides, some means may not be found of bringing it to the surface and ensuring co-operation in the performance of the great task of providing a workable constitution. Indians as a whole are an accessible and generous-minded people. If once the English can induce Indians to believe—as the Commissioners endeavoured so earnestly but apparently so vainly to do—that every effort is being made consistently and conscientiously, albeit with a judicious regard to minimise the risks which undue haste involves, to bring the promise constantly reiterated that India shall have responsible government as an integral part of the great Imperial Commonwealth within measurable distance of fulfilment, then peace and progress are assured.

In some quarters there are sanguine expectations of a satisfactory issue to the deliberations of the forthcoming Conference. A distinguished British statesman has recently, in terms more candid than diplomatic, put himself at pains to warn his fellow-countrymen and his fellow Indian subjects against any undue optimism on that account. Those who were members of the Indian Statutory Commission after their recent experiences

hardly needed such a cautioning. But however little optimistic they may be, whether the recommendations which they have embodied in their Report after so much diligence, trouble, and personal inconvenience are acceptable to those who sit upon that Conference or otherwise, it is their earnest prayer that success may attend its labours and that a way may be found thereby to an enduring and peaceful solution. If the ideas which all the divers and conflicting elements contribute can be fused together in that crucible, then something solid, something enduring, something valuable will doubtless emerge. But these elements will have to prove far more malleable than previous experience of them seems to indicate if such a result is to be achieved.

Unfortunately, the situation in India is for the time being dominated by the obdurate and the irreconcilable, by men of age and experience no less than by impetuous and ignorant youth who mistake invective for constructive statesmanship and who, swayed by the childish rhetoric of the demagogue, are to-day the worst enemies of India's constitutional progress. Obsessed by the historical example set by those who have waded through slaughter to their ideals, they inculcate the doctrine that moderation is of no avail, that what they mistake for freedom can only be achieved by letting loose the most dangerous elements in the community, and that the only way to oppose effectively one particular form of government is to destroy the foundations of all government. It would doubtless be vain to address an appeal to men so infatuated. But if they were amenable to reason I would invite them to turn to the published writings of Edmund Burke, and there they will find, in the famous letter written to Lord Charlemont during the earlier days of the French Revolution, this sentence, which seems eminently applicable to their case: 'Men must have a certain fund of natural moderation to qualify them for freedom, else it becomes noxious to themselves and a perfect nuisance to everybody else.'

EDWARD CADOGAN.

Art. 5.—THE JESUITS.

1. *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits.* By René Fülöp-Miller. Putnam, 1930.
2. *Pascal.* By Jacques Chevalier. Sheed and Ward, 1930.

ST FRANCIS OF ASSISI and the *jongleurs de Dieu* started out to reconquer the world for the Church by living in the world the life of the Sermon on the Mount. St Ignatius Loyola planned to reconquer a world, grown far more sophisticated, by persuasion and, his critics would say, by cajolement. Since the founding of the Society of Jesus, its members have kept one aim steadily in view. That aim may be described as winning man back to his allegiance to God, or, from the other point of view, of the luring man back to the Church and the retention of his loyalty to it. The Franciscan gospel was simple and comprehensive: 'God's in His heaven, all's right with the world.' Men were bidden to be happy and kind because they were the objects of Divine love. Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we shall be with the Saints! The idea of St Ignatius was equally comprehensive. He taught that salvation was attainable by all men, though perhaps only after much fasting and prayer. That is the distinction of the Jesuits. Salvation is not for the few, but for the many; not only for the saint and the mystic, but for the normal, average man with all the normal, average man's deficiencies.

The Society of Jesus² was the great creation of the Counter-Reformation. As Herr Fülöp-Miller suggests, the history of the Roman Church since the Reformation is largely the history of the Jesuits. In the struggle that began with the revolt of Luther and has continued through the centuries, they have been 'the light cavalry' of the Papacy—tireless, expert, resourceful, devoted. They have been reviled and misrepresented by writers as learned as Pascal and as prejudiced as Charles Kingsley. They have been banished from almost every country in which they have settled. They have been formally suppressed by a Papal Bull. And to-day they remain the greatest intellectual force of the Church, particularly in England and the United States—a fact of very great

significance. Herr Fülöp-Miller finds considerable resemblance in the characteristics of Jesuits and Bolsheviks, and his elaborate study of the Society of Jesus follows his remarkable 'The Mind and Face of Bolshevism.' But the resemblance is not very obvious in his pages, except that the Bolshevik shares to some extent Jesuit discipline and enthusiasm.

At its beginning Jesuitism was a vehement protest against the teaching of the Protestant reformers, which derived from St Augustine. M. Aug. Lemaitre has recently written that St Augustine taught that '*la faute originelle d'Adam, formidable et impardonable, pèse sur la race coupable et perdue, du sein de laquelle la pure bonté de Dieu dégage un petit nombre d'élus prédestinés.*' This statement is open to serious criticism. Calvinism derives from St Augustine, but I should not agree that St Augustine was a Calvinist. But the Jesuit asserts that all men can be saved if they will. They are the apostles of free will against the teachers of predestination. 'I can find God at all times whenever I will,' wrote St Ignatius (I quote Fülöp-Miller), and he bade his followers 'endeavour to lead man to his highest goal with the aid of his natural aspirations and senses.' Man was not a creature all evil, only to be snatched as a brand from the burning in rare cases and as by a miracle, but a being with immense potentialities for good, capable, with the help and guidance of the Church, of working out his own salvation. The Jesuits, Herr Fülöp-Miller says, 'have always been actuated by an incontestable, true love for humanity: even Pascal did not deny this'; though, as Dostoevsky has suggested, they may have loved humanity in an obstinate and peculiar manner. Certainly there is a greater humanism in their gospel than in the gospel of Calvin.

The Jesuit philosophy is Aristotelian. The Platonism of St Augustine remained predominant, though not unchallenged, in the Church until St Thomas Aquinas, who, it is said, learned to read Greek from an Arab doctor from Cordova, introduced Aristotelianism into Catholic thought. St Thomas was concerned with the problem 'whether human actions are, in general, good or bad, according to the end in view,' and he concluded that the morality of every action is determined by the intention behind it. This teaching had, as Herr Fülöp-

Miller points out, been anticipated by earlier authorities, notably by St Chrysostom, St Bernard of Clairvaux, and by Abelard, who declared that 'God does not judge actions but intentions.' The doctrine was adopted and developed by the Jesuits, since it afforded the means of broadening the narrow path that leads to salvation. The Jesuits were recruiting sergeants for the host of heaven. They wanted as many men as possible to be saved. Their business was to inspire hope. 'Send no man away dejected,' was an injunction of their founder :

'The Jesuits were the first to recognise that the complexity of life could not be adjudged by a few inflexible rules, and they took care always to take into consideration to what weaknesses the man was liable, and what conditions should be regarded as extenuating circumstances for his faults. For this purpose, they enumerated, in their books on casuistry, thousands of cases, laid down exactly in each case how the general rules were to be interpreted here, so that undue harshness should be avoided.'

The doctrine of intention became the basis of Jesuit casuistry. It should be added that what has, in this connection, come to be regarded as distinctively Jesuit teaching was shared by many of the great figures of the Counter-Reformation, notably by St Vincent de Paul and St Francis de Sales.

The development of the doctrine of intention was obviously beset with danger. If a man is judged only by his motives, it may well be argued that it is defensible deliberately to do evil that good may come. Ever since the appearance of Pascal's 'Provincial Letters,' the Jesuits have been accused of teaching that this is defensible. The charge was regarded as a truism by the generation of Protestant English brought up on 'Westward Ho!'; but it is demonstrably untrue that the Jesuits have ever inculcated such an immoral general doctrine. At the same time, Herr Fülöp-Miller does well to remind his readers that teachers of morality have often defended the committing of a small sin that a greater offence may be avoided. Martin Luther, for example, declared: 'What wrong can there be in telling a downright good lie for a good cause and for the advancement of the Christian Church?' And the Anglican Bishops,

assembled at Lambeth, have declared that, while the use of contraceptives is a sin, it may be a defensible sin!

There is now a consensus of judgment that Pascal, prejudiced by the Jansenists and hating the doctrine of free will, grossly misrepresented Jesuit moral teaching. In his biography of Pascal, a very admirable achievement, M. Chevalier admits what Voltaire long ago asserted. Isolated passages from the writings of Jesuit casuists are taken from their context. Extravagant individual statements are credited to the whole Society. There are inaccuracies in the quotations. Pascal's charges are certainly not proved. But the peril inherent in the theory that man should be judged solely by his motives cannot be ignored, and it is a fact that it led to casuistical juggling with the moral law, against which protest was reasonable and desirable. But casuistry is, as M. Chevalier says, as necessary in theology as jurisprudence in law, and both are open to abuse. There is casuistry and to spare in the Lambeth Report. In the modern world, indeed, casuistry has extended to politics, to business, to ordinary social life. We are all casuists.

The Jesuits may have held that actions, generally immoral, may, in exceptional circumstances, be righteous. But they are not alone in this. I have already quoted Luther. I recall the author of 'Killing No Murder.' And during the War killing on a wholesale scale for a great national purpose was defended and extolled by the moral teachers of half Christendom. A Jesuit defended the assassination of Henry III of France. It is alleged against the Jesuits that they were continually plotting against the life of Elizabeth. The presence of the *agent provocateur* is evident in the Elizabethan plots, but Parsons was a very different person from Campion! But at least it may be said for the Jesuits they anticipated the Puritans in denying the right divine of kings to govern wrong, and that they insisted that the business of a king was to safeguard the well-being of his people.

In Europe, in the first two centuries of the history of the Society, the Jesuits, as an Anglo-Catholic writer has said, became 'the directors of education, popular confessors, the spiritual advisers of kings and statesmen: to keep the indifferent worldlings in the Church, to lead them to a higher and more spiritual life, was their object.'

But though they were the confidants of kings, they were also the pastors of the poor. And this worked their undoing. Charles III of Spain was outraged by the reports he received from the police concerning Jesuit doings. Herr Fülöp-Miller writes :

' It was said that they regularly gave the populace spiritual exercises, and even conversed with coachmen, lackeys, and other menials ; they also appeared frequently in the galleys and prisons to talk with the convicts over their needs and troubles, and to console them. In the eyes of an autocrat like King Charles, such occupations could only appear as " suspicious actions," prejudicial to the required submission of the people to the ordinance of the government, for, in the opinion of the king, the people had neither to consider nor to complain, but simply to obey.'

The hatred of the Jesuits came to its height by the middle of the eighteenth century. It is mainly to be traced to their persistent hostility to the growing national consciousness, that was stimulated by the Reformation, and to the unrestricted autocracy of princes. Born in the years of the disruption of Christendom, the Society of Jesus existed to restore the unity which it believed, and still believes, depends on submission to the authority of Rome. It taught that the Church demanded from its children a supernational allegiance. To it patriotism was not enough. It steadily opposed the nationalism that dominates the modern world, and has been the most fruitful source of war and destruction. To the Jesuit the term ' national Church ' is a contradiction, and the violent opposition to the Society of Jesus in France is to be traced to the Gallicanism which two hundred years before the Reformation had secured for the Church in France a considerable measure of independence. The Jesuits were denounced as ' Romanists.' They were ' bound by solemn oaths to carry out the orders of a general living in Rome.' Their loyalty to France and the French king must always be suspect. The tone of the denunciations of the learned professors of the Sorbonne in the sixteenth century is oddly like the tone of the speeches that Mr Isaac Foot, M.P., has recently delivered on the Maltese question.

In France, as in England, the Jesuit was dreaded as the astute and unscrupulous envoy of a foreign power.

He, of course, regarded himself as the servant of the divinely appointed authority to whom all men of all races and colours owed fealty. He asked more than the nominal Catholic was ready to give. The submission to Rome is to the Protestant incompatible with the liberty which, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, was regarded as the greatest of all human possessions, and which is now far more insistently threatened by Bolshevism and Fascism than it ever was by Rome. And this submission was never entirely accepted by Catholic nations and still less generally by Catholic princes. Consequently it was for generations not the least onerous part of the Society's mission to hold the European courts and people in more or less subjection to the Pope. To do this was to attain what was fundamentally a spiritual aim of vast significance to civilisation as a whole, to the 'coachmen, lackeys, and other menials,' as well as to courtiers and statesmen, and, in pursuit of their mission, the Jesuits had to be concerned with 'political activity, craft, and intrigue.' Herr Fülöp-Miller says:

'In their endeavours to gain the favour of kings at court, to deal successfully with the highest dignitaries in parliaments and conclaves of princes, and to settle great political disputes as Rome wished them settled, the fathers all too frequently confused the *gloria Dei* with the *gloria mundi*, and were concerned less for the true kingdom of God than for the earthly power and interest of the Church. Thus the Jesuits were responsible for the "substitution of the spirit of political machinations" for the spirit of the Gospel.'

The Jesuit would reply that it was because he was intelligently concerned with 'the true kingdom of God' that he was compelled to secure 'the earthly power and interest of the Church,' to which had been entrusted the mission of salvation, and that to do this successfully he had realistically to face the facts, and to suit his means to his end. The children of light must show themselves more than a match for the children of this world. The Jesuit must 'live by opportunity and circumstances.' St Ignatius himself said that 'the employment of human means at the right time, if they are applied purely in the service of God, is not evil.' Lord Acton, who did not love the Society, says that St Ignatius insisted that more

prudence and less piety is better than more piety and less prudence.

Protestants and many Catholics detested the Jesuits as the highly effective soldiers of Rome. Nationalists detested them because they demanded a larger loyalty, foreseeing the new paganism that nationalism has now become. Bismarck, it may be remembered, attacked the Jesuits for 'their abjuration of and absolution from all national bonds, and their disintegration and destruction of all national bonds and national movements wherever they are to be found.' Jansenists, who were incidentally Gallicans, and pious Dominicans, denounced their methods and their pandering to our fallen human nature. And princes hated them because they were the enemies of tyranny and cared for the humble and the weak. 'Sovereign power,' the celebrated Laynez declared at the Council of Trent, 'was originally vested in the people,' a sufficiently revolutionary doctrine. And he added that, 'if the sovereign failed to govern in accordance with the wishes of his subjects, then they were free to reassert their prerogatives and depose the sovereign.'

The Spaniard, Mariana, was more explicit in his tract 'De rege et regis institutione.' Herr Fülöp-Miller says :

'He went still further, however, by advancing the view that if, instead of ruling justly, the sovereign rules despotically and abuses his power by oppressing his subjects, then the people are justified in ridding themselves of their despotic ruler, even by violence if need be. The proper procedure in such cases was for the people assembled in solemn conclave to deprive the ruler of the prerogatives vested in him, and to pronounce formal judgment of death on the tyrant; if, however, by reason of external circumstances, it was not possible to adopt this procedure, then, in certain circumstances, every individual citizen was justified in giving effect to the will of the people as a whole, and in removing the tyrant by violence.'

This defence of the right of insurrection was accompanied by an apology for assassination, Mariana declaring of Clement, the assassin of Henry III, from every point of view a most offensive ruler, that 'the majority of people look upon him as having done honour to France,' which was almost certainly true.

Such is the irony of all human affairs that while it

has been in the mission field that the Society of Jesus has effected its most splendid achievements, it was by its mission work that it excited the most bitter enmity. From the first the whole world was the Jesuit's parish :

'The Jesuits, however, have not limited their service in the "army of Christ" to the stillness of the cloister or to the debates of ecclesiastical convocations, but have extended it to the whole world, to the cabinets of rulers and ministers, to parliaments and universities, to the audience halls of Asiatic despots, to the camp-fires of the Red Indians, to observatories, physiological and psychological institutes, the stages of theatres, the congresses of learned men and the tribunes of political oratory ; they have sought to subordinate all man's thoughts and feelings to the Faith, and they have claimed the whole, noisy world, with its wealth of interests and objects, as the sphere of their religious activities.'

St Francis Xavier, the apostle of the Far East, whose story Herr Fülöp-Miller tells at length, remains the greatest of all Christian missionaries—tireless, sympathetic, heroic, astute. So successful was the work of St Francis and his associates that in 1552, the year of the Saint's death, it was reported to Rome that 'in ten years the whole of Japan will be Christian.' The evangelisation of America was hardly less successful, and no less intelligent and humane. The Jesuits built schools as well as churches. To them the natives were brothers to be saved, not serfs to be exploited, and in Paraguay they established an ecclesiastically-ruled state in which the human rights of the people were respected, and where, to the horror of their neighbours, taxation was reduced to the smallest possible scale. The eighteenth-century French philosophers were certainly not prejudiced in the Jesuits' favour, but Montesquieu declared that 'the Society of Jesus may pride itself on the fact that it was the first to prove to the world that religion and humanity are compatible'; D'Alembert wrote that 'they rendered happy the people under their sway, they succeeded in subduing them without ever having to resort to force'; and Voltaire described the Paraguayan mission as 'a triumph of humanity.'

Devotion, intelligence, and humanity were, however, powerless in the long run when pitted against prejudice, ignorance, and greed. In India the Portuguese opposed

the Jesuits because they were supported by Louis XIV. They claimed 'the sole right of conducting the work of converting the peoples of the Far East,' and it apparently was a small matter whether they attempted to accomplish the work or not. In China and Japan the Jesuits were assailed by the Dominicans and Franciscans, who had both signally failed in their own missionary efforts. These good men shared the crudities of some of the modern Protestant missionaries. They taught that all non-Christians, even Confucius himself and the dead Emperors whom the Chinese held in high honour, were most certainly damned, and that the only way in which a similar fate could be avoided was by the unquestioning acceptance of the doctrines which the missionaries taught.

The Jesuits had a different method. In India they studied the Vedas, and became expert in the knowledge of Indian religion and philosophy, striving to find resemblances with the Christian teaching and thus persuading from one plane, the dignity and partial truth of which they recognised, to a higher. In China they attracted attention by their interest in science and art. They began 'their missionary work with maps, clocks, mirrors, reading-glasses, and paintings.' They translated the liturgy into Chinese. In some small respects they adapted the Catholic rites to placate Chinese prejudices. It was alleged that they said nothing of the Crucifixion, fearing that the Chinese would never believe that God could suffer so shameful a death. They were further charged with allowing their converts to continue the traditional rites in honour of the dead. It is probable that the Jesuits may have gone too far in their policy of making easy the way of salvation, but their method of attempting to show that Christianity is a development, and not a contradiction, of all other religions has become the note of all intelligent missionary effort, and their second policy of encouraging the Church to grow naturally, according to the mind and tradition of different peoples, provided always that essential truth was accepted, recently received official Papal approval, when a number of native Chinese bishops were consecrated in St Peter's.

The great work of St Francis Xavier was largely undone. Twice had the Far East been evangelised, once in the early centuries by the great Nestorian Church,

which spread across Asia and had a patriarchate in China, and which is now reduced to a handful of adherents in Iraq, and again by the Jesuits. Japan was to be entirely Christian in 1562. It is progressive and still largely pagan in 1930! In America the colonists were quite glad that the natives should be converted; but they were outraged when they discovered that 'the Jesuits wished to give their converts almost the same rights as human beings.' The missionaries, too, allowed their black slaves, imported from Africa, to possess land, and gave them a certain amount of leisure. That was bad enough:

'But the Jesuits did an even more unheard-of thing. With the cunning for which they were famous, they induced the authorities to issue an order requiring the other settlers to allow their slaves a certain amount of occasional leisure for the purpose of receiving instruction in the Christian doctrines, which meant that their masters would lose some of their slaves' labour and would thus suffer pecuniary loss.'

In Canada they interfered with trade by trying to prevent the sale of 'fire-water' to the Indians. In South America they denounced slave raids. Everywhere they were a nuisance, and the Paraguay experiment was intolerable. In 1759 the Spanish authorities put an end to the Jesuit rule in what Herr Fülöp-Miller calls 'the forest Utopia.' The schools were closed. A great library was destroyed. Church ornaments were stolen:

"When we consider," writes Joseph de Maistre, "that this order, inspired by the doctrines of the Christian Church, founded its rulership in Paraguay solely on the influence of its virtues and of its talents, that the Jesuits taught the savages of South America to appreciate the magic influence of music, when finally we remember that it was only through the co-operation of corrupt ministries and of courts of justice which had been seized by madness that it became possible to overthrow this magnificent Society, then only can we visualise in our imagination that madman who rejoicingly tramples a clock beneath his feet, crying the while: 'I will stop your noise!'"

The Jesuits were now the objects of fierce dislike 'in the European courts, in the convents, boudoirs, and professors' studies.' In 1759 they were banished from Portugal and her colonies. In 1767 they were banished

from the Spanish dominions. Of European sovereigns only Maria Theresa remained their friend, though Mme de Pompadour, whose favour the virtuous Queen was for family reasons anxious to secure, 'lived in ceaseless fear of the Jesuits and humbly courted their favour,' and, be it added, courted it in vain. In 1762 the Paris *Parlement* decided that the Jesuits should be expelled from France. It was difficult to convince Louis XV that they were immoral, since they had so often made difficulties with regard to his Easter confessions, but he could not afford to quarrel with the *Parlement*. The Jesuit houses, schools, and churches were closed, and 'the beautiful Mme de Pompadour at last won the victory over the obdurate confessors.' Eleven years afterwards, on July 21, 1773, Pope Clement XIV published the brief 'Dominus ac Redemptor' completely suppressing the Society. Whatever may have been their vices, it is historically clear that it was for their virtues that the Jesuits suffered. The suppression was never effective. A 'Society of the Faith of Jesus' was started in Rome, and a 'Society of the Heart of Jesus' in Austria. Jesuit fathers found shelter in Prussia and Russia; and in 1814 the Society was fully reinstated by Pope Pius VII, in the Bull 'Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum.' Rome badly needed its 'light cavalry.'

The history of the Society during the last hundred and sixteen years has been full of vicissitudes. They have, at times, been suppressed in France, in Germany, in Switzerland, and in Portugal. They have had always to reckon with the hostility of secular priests and prelates—among them Cardinal Manning—and of the other religious orders. But their influence to-day is as great as ever. They again have missions in South America and the Far East. They are the greatest intellectual force of the Roman Church in England. The most popular protagonist of the Church is a Jesuit Father, and Farm Street is the scene of numerous conversions and instructions. Jesuits are playing an equally important part in the United States, where they control newspapers, schools, and university colleges. The success of the Jesuit is the success of the expert. He is a man who knows his job. His training lasts for fifteen years. Before he is ordained priest, he has had a training unparalleled in its thorough-

6

ness. But this training has never destroyed individuality; I quote Herr Fülöp-Miller :

‘ From the beginning, the Society of Jesus has known how to make use of the personal qualities of its members, and it is in this very combination of discipline and individualism that the novelty of the community founded by Ignatius lies.

‘ A Jesuit might very well be “ a staff in the hand of an old man ” when his superior assigned to him a definite mission and imparted to him the necessary instructions ; but within the limit of his instructions he could display his personal initiative. . . . Whatever a man may think of the activities of the Society, it cannot be denied that the Society presents an unparalleled example of the organisation of the will of every individual to obey, an organisation scattered over the whole world whose members act independently in their own spheres of activity, and at the same time, when circumstances demand it, are prepared humbly to obey commands. Only such an organisation, combining the most rigid discipline with individual freedom of movement, could have made possible the inner unity of the order and its astonishing continuity throughout the centuries in the face of the widest geographical dispersal ; and herein lies the secret of the power once exercised by the Jesuits, and which, to a considerable extent, they exercise to-day.’

And the Society deprecates any preferment for its members. Jesuits become bishops and even cardinals, but always unwillingly.

There remains to consider the relation between the Jesuit and modern thought and speculation. The aim of the neo-scholasticism, with which the Jesuits are closely connected, and which owed much to the late Cardinal Mercier, is, as Herr Fülöp-Miller says, ‘ the establishment of a synthesis between the Aristotelian-Thomist basic principles of scholastic philosophy and the results of modern scientific research.’ How far the attempt can ever be successful is sheer conjecture, and Herr Fülöp-Miller is certainly safe when he says that ‘ the reconciliation of the two extremes of thought represented by Thomas Aquinas and Kant will no doubt prove to be one of the most difficult tasks the Jesuits have ever undertaken.’ Apart from their example of devotion and thoroughness, despite, perhaps, their unscrupulousness, European society owes the Jesuits a heavy debt. They

educated Voltaire, Diderot, and Descartes. They encouraged Molière, Corneille, and Calderon. Michelangelo was the friend of St Ignatius. The Society was the patron of Rubens and Van Dyck. Herr Fülöp-Miller laments that Jesuit scholars have degraded research by making it the handmaid of theology. They have always had an ulterior purpose. They have not sought knowledge for its own sake. Nevertheless he admits :

' Particularly great is the enrichment for which European science has to thank the Jesuit missionaries. For it was they who were the first to undertake adventurous journeys through hitherto untrodden lands and continents, and to report what they had discovered.* It was through them that Europe learnt of the conditions in the interior of Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Tibet and Mongolia, and, as they almost always combined their missionary journeys with cartographic surveys, they were of the greatest assistance to later geographers.

' The services rendered by the fathers to the study of languages were no less considerable, for, as they always began their missionary work by making the closest study of the idiom of the peoples they hoped to convert, they compiled dictionaries and grammars of almost all the languages of the North and South American Indians, of India and Indo-China, and of the Japanese. . . .

' Finally, the stimulus which European thought received from the knowledge of Indian and Chinese culture imparted by the Jesuits was of the greatest significance. For the fathers were not only the first to study Sanskrit, they also published translations of the Vedas, and thus directed the attention of the West to Indian philosophy and religion ; they must then be regarded as the originators of the great European spiritual tendency which has ultimately led to the theosophical movement of our days.'

The Jesuits are by tradition ultramontane of the ultramontanes. Acton says that they were suppressed in the 18th century because they 'represented the old order that was changing and the authority of the ecclesiastical law that was being restrained.' But, perhaps because of the Aristotelianism that is the basis of their philosophy, they have shown an amazing power of adaptability to the changing circumstances of the ages. The Jesuit is always modern !

SIDNEY DARK.

Art. 6.—THE CALL TO EFFICIENCY.

1. *Whither Mankind? A Panorama of Modern Civilisation.* Edited by Charles A. Beard. Longmans, 1928.
 2. *The History of British Civilisation.* By Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, D.Sc. Two vols. Routledge, 1928.
 3. *The European Heritage. A Synopsis of European Cultural Achievement.* By Watson Kirkconnell. Dent, 1930.
 4. *How Britain is Governed. A Critical Analysis of Modern Developments in the British System of Government.* By Ramsay Muir. Constable, 1930.
 5. *Wealth and Life. A Study in Values.* By J. A. Hobson. Macmillan, 1929.
 6. *The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy.* By G. D. H. Cole. Macmillan, 1929.
- And other works.

SOME time ago a man active in public life, hearing a street-corner agitator fulminating against certain social hardships and the prospects of the particular political Utopia of his dismal dreams, declared that every candidate for Parliament should be compelled to read Gibbon's 'History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire' and Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations' for the breadth of historical vision and the necessary bases of economic principles established by those works. Possibly if that observer were making such declaration now, he would substitute for the volumes that he named books of similar purposes and appeal but less affected by the discoveries of the years elapsed since they were written. The general truth of the remark, however, remains. Knowledge and wide views; 'Study the maps'; 'Check your references,' as the late Lord Salisbury said. In any case an acceptance of the principles of economic truth and of the experiences of mankind as recorded in history are more necessary than ever now that life, public and private, has become so intricate and rapid; with questions of enormous importance—national, imperial, and international—occurring often with surprising suddenness and requiring immediate action and settlement by a Democracy which may not be well-prepared for them.

The works listed at the head of this article may be

taken as representing some of the essential aspects of the world-problem that confronts us. An admirable study of British history by Dr Wingfield-Stratford, giving a comprehensive view of the slow, gradual development of our people and of their constitution which has set a model for other nations to work by; an appreciation by a Canadian professor of the cultural and industrial contribution of Europe to the general well-being of the world; a stimulating inquiry, entitled 'Whither Mankind?' made by a number of authorities, mainly American, though they also include Mr Bertrand Russell and the Sidney Webbs, as to the future results of past and present social tendencies, especially those due to the overwhelming growth of a mechanistic age; followed by a thoughtful but depressing study of the old, worn methods of government under the British Constitution by Mr Ramsay Muir, an intellectualist of the Liberal die-hards, who seem, however, certainly soon to die; with some extremest economic views and assertions of policy, rather indirectly than directly useful, by Mr J. A. Hobson and Mr G. D. H. Cole. All these works are honest and well-meant; while two of them, that by Dr Wingfield-Stratford and 'Whither Mankind?' may fairly be called brilliant.

Although there is a common acceptance of the truth that the world has changed extraordinarily since the war, it does not seem that many persons, comparatively speaking, are seriously endeavouring to alter their ways in consequence. It is, of course, difficult for most of us to become enough detached from the flow and swirl of current conditions, the daily round, to see how far things have changed since a few years ago; but it can and must be done if a nation or individual is not to become effete or lost; for it is just such independence and freshness of view as produces the opposite tendency, which makes a man the master of his fellows and an effective leader. Difficult as it always is under ordinary stress to secure a sound, unprejudiced view of things, it is especially difficult, and for that reason the more necessary, now that the world is sick, hard-up, and weary; after great progress suffering the pressure of adverse conditions, and knowing severe disillusionments, especially over those predilections and strengths which had been the particular, even the boasted pride of the Victorians. The zest of those elect

generations for Organisation, for Economy in national finance, for Reform and Peace, for the sometimes uncharitable zeal and energy of their religious missions; their faith in the gospels of Respectability and Self-Help, were all governed by principles that have faded. It is still too much the fashion or the weakness at present to think with disdain, not unmixed with envy, of the Victorians and their self-satisfaction; but no small measure of that disdain, and assuredly all the envy, spring from the knowledge that over many things, and especially over high principles and great purposes, we live in a period less nobly and consciously aspiring than was that which heard the messages of Ruskin, Carlyle, Tennyson, Livingstone, and Darwin, the last of whom, in his modest spirit and world-wide influence still potent, was greatest of them all.

Such a doubtful attitude towards any earlier age of advance is a sign of insufficiency somewhere—it may be of inefficiency also—in our age; not that we need to go back to the methods and ideals, or prejudices, of half a century ago or of any former period; but because by spending time in vain condescension we may be missing an opportunity for making further progress ourselves; and, Heaven knows, we still have leeway to make up, mending the monstrous waste in material wealth and spiritual exhaustion of the World War, so that sluggishness in action or thought in this difficult present is something of a sin against Civilisation. It is because of the sharp protest it makes against such complacency that the volume 'Whither Mankind?' is opportune. It brings a frank reminder that idleness and stupidity in the world of to-day simply cannot be tolerated if failure is to be avoided. There is no time for self-conceit or for stale methods, or for the encouragement of the merely pompous or fashionable; and the sight of the playing-fields full of flannelled and muddled performers—not to go quite so far in epithets as Mr Kipling helpfully went—is a reminder that we really must play less and work more, until we have earned our leisure. Such energies as are spent in propelling and chasing balls and in cheering their pursuit can only be encouraged if they are supplemented by greater efforts in the industrial creation of wealth, more wealth, as unless the prosperity of our country and of

all countries is increased, there must be further deprivation, want, still more unemployment and discontent, with the possibilities of moral and economic bankruptcy and revolution. It would be well, also, if the leisured classes, as they are called, who can enjoy the easier indulgences of life would more evidently justify their usefulness; for the impressions given of the 'idle rich,' as also they are called, basking in perpetual holiday sunshine and neither toiling nor spinning, can only bring discontent to those of the producers whose hours of labour are heavy and whose wages, under a normal economic system, are necessarily low.

'The machine is the authentically embodied Logos of modern life.' That is the assertion of Mr John Dewey, and with the innumerable implications that spring from it may be taken as an expression of a main truth of these times. To the end of his days John Ruskin abused the railways—and used them. His protest was based upon æsthetic grounds and was, and is, much sympathised with by those to whom the unspoiled beauty of nature is sacred. Yet there are other sides to that question. Should we enjoy Nature so much if she were not sometimes fettered, and if the leisure in which to enjoy her had not been won through the greater productivity and improved standard of comfort resulting from the use of the machines and railways? On this point we get an opinion expressed by a Chinese practical philosopher, Dr Hu Shih, in answering the frequent assertion that the East is the supreme depository of spiritual wisdom as distinct from the supposed hard materialism of the West; and it is stimulating to receive a definite refutation of that from an Asiatic. Dr Hu Shih discovered that the border-line between Eastern and Western civilisation comes at the city of Harbin which separates what he calls the jinricksha civilisation from that of the motor-car.

'What spirituality is there in a civilisation which tolerates such a terrible form of human slavery as the 'ricksha coolie? Do we seriously believe that there can be any spiritual life left in those poor human beasts of burden who run and toil and sweat under that peculiar bondage of slavery which knows neither the minimum wage nor any limit of working hours? . . . It is only then that one will be truly and religiously moved to bless the Hargreaves, the Cartwrights,

the Watts, the Fultons, the Stephensons, and the Fords who have devised machines to do the work for man and relieve him from much of the brutal suffering to which his Oriental neighbour is still subject.'

That opinion may be taken as the keynote of 'Whither Mankind?' which sees in the efficient service of the machine and the machine-age something that in the development of culture, as well as in the production of wealth, was inevitable and necessary; destructive, no doubt, to some parts of beauty, but after a while also strengthening to beauty in fact, and to the ideals that govern it. It is indeed rather startling to realise, as is brought home in this book, that after all something can be said for the indirect æsthetic effects of the Factory System. The story of the Industrial Revolution in its early stages and until forty or so years ago was unquestionably dark and evil, infamous, beginning with the riots of the misled Luddites who broke the earliest machines, and going on through the horrors of unrestricted child-labour and other abominations due to greed and want of restrictions in the factories, to the growth of the Black Country and the sprawling slum-towns with their stunted, poisoned populations, and other bright triumphs for the Manchester School and its blessed, holy doctrine of *Laissez Faire*.

That is, however, an old and bitter story. It is well to recall it because the Machine, the god in which was proverbial for his divine carelessness, is now, we learn, the Logos, the newest Word, the chosen instrument to mould the future, even more than it has modified and materially enriched the past; but it is well not to forget the drudgery, toil, and suffering that went with its origins. As we are, it seems, to suffer and enjoy all the power and super-organisation of a sublimated machine-age it is best to accept it frankly—and who does not accept it will evidently be expected to starve—and to make the best of it; so developing its efficiency that infinite wealth will be produced and the standard of living and real wages rise, with the result that after a time the hours of work will be shortened through sufficient wealth being more cheaply and speedily obtained; and then, it is to be hoped, we shall be able to go to the playing-fields with better conscience than at present. Such, of course, is the visionary end of that palliative of industrial ills,

Rationalisation, which Mr Hobson, however, looks at doubtfully because he sees no adequate expansion of markets for the consumption of the vast quantities of goods which the overwhelming and more efficient machinery of the new age will produce. That doubt, no solitary uncertainty in the prospects before us, shows that a deal of grit is likely to be found lurking in the wheels of the masterly machine before it will have brought us to the expected Paradise of gold and plenty. Some such imperfections, however, accompanied every phase and advance of corporate organisation and must be allowed for. The facts of displaced labour and the consequent social unsettlement are the darkest clouds on the horizon of the future and there will be many other causes for disquiet. The first necessity now is to realise that no amount of sentimental regret can alter the fact that as a nation we must grow more practical and efficient and less wasteful, careless, and stupid, or we shall lose the race with other nations and cease to be not only a first-class power but a people with a decent standard of living and self-respect.

If we are not masters of the future we shall be its slaves, but there is no cause for fear 'if England to herself remain but true'; as of all the nations of the earth, none, not excepting our successful cousins of the United States, are better fitted for the fight towards welfare than the British with their Empire and opportunities for 'making good'; and it is there that Dr Wingfield-Stratford's History is helpful. He has traced the growth of the British civilisation and constitution from their beginnings, bringing out their individuality and usefulness with a rare spirit, a truthful imagination and freshness of phrase; and although here or there a reader may feel that he is unjust—as in his immoderate condemnation of England for the tragical misfortunes of Ireland, sad, heavy, and blameworthy as that story is bound to be—his work reaches a high plane of style and historic vision. He sees in the primitive Englishman essential qualities and faults that are characteristic of his descendants to-day. 'The "nation of shopkeepers" was already in embryo, melancholy, practical men, kindly and courteous by nature, independent, and yet with a deep-rooted respect for persons and loyalty to the right kind of master.'

Matter-of-fact, yet not without imagination. Then, in one of those inspired and sensible flights of this historian who through them shows how truly he loves and is proud of his country, while seeing her faults, 'If we hold that a Vere de Vere landed at Pevensey with the Conqueror, we must not forget that a still more distinguished passenger stepped from the beaked galley of Hengist. His name was John Bull.' With such continuity of experience and sustained effort, covering more than a thousand years, we can feel encouraged to face the future—be it ever so specialised and mechanistic—with a cheer.

There is also ingrained in the race a profound respect for Tradition and faithfulness to Precedent, a time-honoured tendency and practice which, like the seafaring instincts of the British, goes with the blood. Of this an illuminating example, too attractive to be avoided, is shown in Mr Philip Snowden. Before the Chancellor of the Exchequer came to the responsibilities of his office he was a very Robespierre of British politics, a 'sea-green incorruptible,' the James Maxton of the other day, an intellectual firebrand, though ever cold as ice, and bitterly opposed to every aspect of the *status quo*. Then came elections and accidents; the Liberal Party dwindled to an abiding weakness, the Labour-Socialist grew strong enough to be the second largest Party in the State. They came to office, were appointed His Majesty's Ministers, and so fell under the tremendous influence of the permanent Civil Service, of which Mr Ramsay Muir has much to say; and here we have Citizen Snowden an unbending advocate of orthodox finance, answering questions after the manner of Palmerston while wearing the mantle of Gladstone, and resisting often with a sting every proposal which shows the faintest touch of economic heterodoxy. It is a striking illustration of the effect of Precedents and Tradition and of ministerial responsibility in our essentially conservative country.

More stable yet, amongst our national safeguards, bringing steadfastness and security to our citizenship, governing and making historic the spirit of justice and fairplay between man and man, there is the Common Law, of which Dr Wingfield-Stratford says, in a passage of thought and insight worth recording:

'To an Ulpian or Papinian such a structure as the English Common Law would no doubt have appeared as mere chaotic barbarism. It had inherited from the Saxon all the verbal formality that had marked the proceedings of oath-helpers; there was a correct form for each action, and the slightest deviation therefrom would lose the litigant his case. It relied to an extraordinary degree upon precedent; records of cases were being kept before the close of the twelfth century, and provide the material for the classic treatise of Bracton. English Law did undoubtedly suffer from the want of logical simplicity, it was cumbrous, formal, and hopelessly complicated, but it was a living growth rooted to the soil like one of those knarled and twisted oaks that stands proof against the storms of centuries. It grew with the growth of England, it was planted in her American Colonies, and when her sovereignty departed, her law remained; it has proved the most beneficent gift that she has been able to confer upon her Empire of India; it has developed into a system of jurisprudence equal to that of Rome in the extent of its influence, and perhaps destined to surpass it by virtue of the individualism which, like that of a Gothic cathedral, is its informing principle' (p. 150).

So we see that it is with a rich endowment from the past as well as with the abiding energy and resourcefulness of its freely associated peoples that the British Empire brings its contribution to the future of the world. We see in the Commonwealth of Nations, of which the King is the personal centre, an agglomeration of peoples held together by similar ideals and mutual sympathies, and our one great body of Common Law. In spite of the peevishness and complaints of the little people who in peace-time blind themselves with self-approval and in war-time hide in the funk-holes of pacificism, it is the greatest moral factor in the world because of the broad ideals, humanity, and spirit of fair play in its Government. Others may criticise, but the fact remains. The British Commonwealth is a living expression of those principles of popular rights and liberties that were established by Acts and Charters won after centuries of tribulation, sacrifice, and justified revolt; while its outstanding influence for good is proved, indirectly, by the subtle and persistent efforts of Bolshevist propagandists to befoul its purposes and sow violent discontent among its more credulous and least informed or more selfish subjects.

Yet, if we are true to ourselves, not faltering when purposes are clear, the Commonwealth must retain and spread still further its beneficent influence.

For the tendency towards new continental or inter-racial confederations, of which the United States of North America was the first of modern instances and the British Commonwealth of Nations is the most recent, is certain to grow; and before very long, in the slow processes of time, the United States of South America and a confederation of Eastern Asia, with Japan as its leading factor and the masses of China brought to a more vigorous unity, will be amongst the leading possibilities. The imagination is encouraged to build further vast organised confraternities of the kind all over the world. Already under the inspiration of M. Briand, that most far-seeing and chivalrous of French statesmen, a beginning has been made towards establishing the United States of Europe; and although his first written approach has been rejected by Germany—not disposed to accept an arrangement that suggests her abandoning the hope of modifying the Treaty of Versailles—and not accepted by England, with her own world-wide confederation and her insular separation from the continent, it is probable that before this century is out, that broad-based political dream will be a working fact, with, who knows, what heavy difficulties and problems to hamper its elaborate courses? Yet such a change from the present chaos and dangerous confusion of jealous rival nations, who will not frankly disarm, is surely very desirable and a logical development of the principles underlying the League of Nations. It is, however, well with such a new union of states in prospect to get used to the thought of Europe as a definite and self-interested unit with its many discordant nations and nationalities combined in one vast confederation; and to that end Mr Watson Kirkconnell's synopsis of European cultural achievement is useful. This Canadian historian, in detailing with almost breathless compactness the unequalled contribution of artistic loveliness and thought as well as of industrial riches made by Europe to civilisation, takes a wide survey and wields a pointed pen. In his appreciation of the manifold works of the Western continent, artistic and intellectual, he does not omit lively references to those Indians, the Gypsies, and those

Asiatics, the Jews; and in his synopsis and catalogue of the uplifting triumphs of the artists, poets, and other creators of true life and beauty in Europe, smites with bright words 'the reptiles of caste privilege and dogmatic oppression,' the ruinous conquerors, like Louis Quatorze and Napoleon, each of whom was a 'glittering curse to human life' and the 'pig-headed would-be absolutists,' all of them obstacles to progress, now tumbled on the historical dustheap—how quickly such tinsel soils!—clearing the way for the powerful wheels whose revolutions are to mark the approaching mechanistic age.

With the nations tending to group themselves into conglomerate super-states for the added security that comes from massed numbers as well as to thin or remove the tariff and other inimical barriers that divide them, England will need all her determination, resources of mind and matter, inspired commonsense and efficiency to hold her own against an enranked Europe and the rest of the world. But, as has been suggested, we need not fear our losing place amongst the foremost nations, if we remain true to the best that we have inherited; but we cannot too soon recognise the severity of the new conditions. The faculty for 'muddling through' in these circumstances will not be possible; though, speaking seriously, have we ever 'muddled through' any crisis? Of course not. The muddling there was had to be brought to a prompt end before the natural skill and ingenuity available could work. It is a well-worn gibe—the British being the shrewdest, most humorous critics of the British—but the Commonwealth would not be where and what it is if a natural sluggishness and idleness of mind were not associated with and, when the necessity was unmistakably urgent, displaced by masterly eagerness, will, strength, and skill. It will then be essential for the parts of the Empire to stand together, helping each other in loyalty and practical service; and for that reason it is to be hoped that the premature efforts now being made to bring about what is loosely called 'Empire Free Trade' may be given up before they injure permanently the willingness of the Dominions to accept still closer union of spirit and methods with us; while to split the Conservative Party, the Party best devoted to the good of the whole Empire, in order to

force a nostrum which responsible statesmen of the Dominions have declared they cannot accept, is to threaten abiding injury to an inspiring cause. The task is one for statesmen; not for newspaper lords in a printer's hurry. Rival industries and tariff walls, the real obstacles in the way, are not to be dismissed by a headline or even by a 'stunt,' for some thought over reasons and consequences is still required in the world of practical affairs.

As a nation we must set our house in order. It is necessary to re-equip and possibly in some details scrap our institutions. That more often than not they are time-honoured is a consideration entitling us to pause, especially before any approach to a clean sweep; but the pause must not be too protracted—it has already in some cases lasted for many precious years—and to keep an engine behind-time and inefficient for sentimental reasons is neither fair to the engine nor to the sentiment. Of some of the necessary processes of such improvement we shall speak further shortly, but meanwhile there is something more immediately urgent still, and that is to make the economic conditions at home more stable and favourable to industry and general well-being than they are. Unemployment! The word is a black menace; the fact, of course, is a disaster. Many more than two million men, women, and youths of both sexes out of wage-earning work in a population of some forty-five millions with all the demoralisation that too often must accompany that condition. Yet it is said that for general prosperity we are now better off than are most other highly organised countries, where the statistics of compulsory idleness and destitution are not so precisely kept, and where wages are lower. Attempts are being made to combat the disease, but it is evident that a large-visioned imperial policy and not mere transitory and nibbling local efforts is called for. Over-taxation, mainly due to the load of the National Debt, compelling a heavy and continuous drain on the capital resources of industry, the very life-blood of prosperity, must be eased. For the conditions work in a vicious circle. Unemployment, dole, heavy taxation, restricted industry, unemployment, dole—and so it goes on in a dance of depression. We must economise and thereby reduce taxation so that more capital shall be available for industry. The statistics of employment

must then improve, with the result that the dead weight of dole will be less and more capital and human energy become available for industry. It may seem easy enough to put down these words which, of course, do not in any way measure the full and extreme complexity of the problem; but with all their bald simplicity they are true. It is necessary to insist that the national finances shall be administered with such care that waste may be eliminated, and it is equally necessary to prevent any further extension of spoon-feeding privileges to poor or to rich; then at once the darkness would begin to clear—so long as we work and create productive wealth.

Looking backwards it is easy to see that Mr Baldwin made a bad choice when he invited Mr Winston Churchill to become his Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was the hour and the wrong man. Like his father, his Victorian predecessor in that office, whose fame, meteoric, he has so thoroughly eclipsed, Mr Churchill was not an expert in administrative finance. Brilliant in other offices, and with his pen, and possibly as a bricklayer, he was out of his element at the Treasury. Lord Randolph Churchill in the frankness of his arithmetical ignorance once blandly described a baffling decimal-point as a qualified dot. Doubtless his son, with his copiousness of vocabulary, would have no difficulty whatever in defining that same point with terminological richness and exactitude, but his qualifications for responsibility at the Treasury, nevertheless, were as wanting as his father's. He predicted a regular annual reduction of ten millions in the total taxation, and promptly falsified the prophecy by increasing the national burden with benefits and pensions which could better have waited for prosperous times. It was an opportunity lost which yet must be re-made and used; and it is not without its ironic humour that the present guardian of the public purse—and enjoying some confidence, too, where pure finance is concerned—should be a doctrinaire Socialist. With the need for strictest economy there yet is room for imagination in the administration of the national finance. In our necessity every little helps. The first thing is to strengthen confidence. Take as an example the penny postage. There was a time when any profit accruing from the postal services was spent on their greater efficiency or in the

reduction of charges, and they were not regarded as a revenue-producing concern. Apparently that principle is forgotten. Last year there was a profit from that department of something like nine millions sterling. When Mr Churchill was the Chancellor he resisted the demand for a return to penny postage by asserting that the restoration would cost the country five millions; and at that time, it is true, the profits were barely so much as that. But why not make the reduction now? Measured in the terms of cash it would be a small thing—for what are five millions when we budget for over seven hundred and fifty millions?—but in moral value it would buy itself back. It would be the removal of a tax on capital and on hard-driven private purses. It would mean the better use of the abundant postal machinery available, and, best of all, it would give encouragement and confidence to traders and the community and there would be such an increase of postal communications that possibly the loss expected from the reduction would disappear. That is an instance of the ways in which trade might be stimulated without recourse to those artificial inducements and tariff restrictions over which there are violent differences of opinion. It is better to go to the agreed remedies, where they can be found, before depending on medicines which some experts, in violent disagreement with one another, call our salvation, and others methods of suicide, and others plain quackery. Co-operation in industry and out of it, and agreed courses, sympathy, and commonsense between masters and workers, even with what is implied in Mr Cole's gibe at 'the honeyed gutturals of Lord Melchett,' are, in any case, pre-eminently required, with a willingness to look in the face facts commercial and industrial, and any fresh suggestions that occur. In the world that, they say, is soon to be, there will be no time or place for strikes and lock-outs. That sort of disagreement has proved already, like war on a large scale, too costly a ramp.

At this stage we may well consider what Mr Ramsay Muir has to say in his searching study of 'How Britain is Governed,' for if Parliament is ineffective, unwieldy, wasteful—and those are but some of the objections urged against its present condition—then must that paramount institution of the State and Commonwealth be vigorously

overhauled and made fit for its national and imperial duties. Briefly, the condition is this, as even those who run must have seen; generally unreformed for all but a hundred years, piecemeal changes having been made in its constitution when the imperfections had grown intolerable, it has become unfitted to the times and to the extraordinary calls made upon it. If in an age of increasing specialisation and ruthless organisation and energy it does not meet the need, where are we to look for the national and legal authority required by a first-class state that is the centre of a world-wide Empire? That costly alternative the dictator—thank Heaven!—does not spring easily from the British soil. The institutions of Parliament must be put in order with vision; they must become more truly representative of the declared will of the majority of the people and possess the widest scope of authority, for although the decisions of the British Parliament will not bind the self-governing democratic states, all equal constituents of the Commonwealth, it still will have the whole of the Empire under its care and view, and be expected to act with its fellow-states whenever their well-being is in question or in danger. It is necessary, therefore, in any reform or remodelling of the constitution of Parliament to remember constantly that it is not merely a British body, concerned only with the Government of these islands, but is the nearest approach possible to a deliberative and administrative great central council, within its own wide province supreme in the Empire. Its great responsibilities can never be neglected now or ignored; if only for the reason—and it is not the sole reason—that without its votes of supply those weapons and sure shields, the Navy and the Army, on which the whole Commonwealth depends would not be available.

Before considering the serious, baffling question of the House of Lords, which, whether the Parties like it or not, will have to be settled, it is necessary to examine the working of the House of Commons, because that is the kernel, the very keystone, of our democratic representative system; and an imperfect First Chamber is manifestly less tolerable than an imperfect Second Chamber has proved, for the reason that its immediate responsibilities are so very much the greater, and it is, or is

supposed to be, sensitively expressive of the popular will. It is impossible here to do more than most slightly suggest the imperfections which must be amended if the Commons are to fulfil their necessary part in the government of the future, and the best way of doing so is to follow Mr Muir's example and describe, though partially and in merest outline, what he does with length, thoroughness, and historical sense, the conditions which have developed and changed almost unconsciously yet rapidly in the later years.

It is the basic principle underlying popular government that every freely elected member of the House of Commons has an equal vote and voice there with his fellows, but in fact it is not so. Although he may vote to his heart's content, hundreds of times in the course of a session, it is rarely an individual vote that he gives. He is one of a rival herd, obedient to the Whip, and often ignorant as to the precise question on which he is voting ; while as for his equal voice, it may be heard at question-time—to remind constituents of his existence—but rarely, and still more rarely usefully, at other times. In fact, his main purpose in Parliament seems to be to ensure that the Party to which he belongs shall have the unconsidered support of his vote whenever a division is called. This melancholy truth is, of course, common property ; but it is necessary to set it down here because the obvious is often overlooked if it is not stated. The House of Commons, through the rigid marshalling of its members by the respective Whips, has become a lumbering machine by means of which the Government of the day forces its legislation and resolutions through and is able to keep office. So seriously has the influence in Parliament of the private member declined that hardly any time for discussion is given to his independent proposals, and there is no chance, it seems, of any private Bill brought in by him being passed into law unless a minister comes to recognise its possibilities, and takes it under the wing of his department. The Cabinet, that chosen few, led by the Prime Minister, *ex officio* the most powerful person in the country, is supreme and has, in appearance, but only in appearance, almost uncontrolled authority, though being mortal, ministers are frequently so overdriven, overworked, and insufficiently informed about the con-

cerns in their charge, that many of their measures go through the formal Parliamentary processes without sufficient thought or discussion ; and that is why too much of the mass of legislation passed is faulty, sometimes mischievous, and in the early end a dead letter.

Behind those master-men in office there is, however, a further power, the unseen considering and deciding factor, ruling the rulers, a Bureaucracy, which sounds more satisfactory when called by its official name, the permanent Civil Service. Since the War, which gave it an enormous impetus, though already Mr Lloyd George had begun the wasteful business, this very expensive body of loyal and efficient servants has swollen in numbers and costliness to such an extent that if the late Mr W. H. Smith or Mr Goschen could revisit the scenes of Government and observe, he would rub his eyes aghast. Of the influence of this great personal staff and its effects, excellent and not so good, Mr Ramsay Muir has much to say which cannot be discussed in these limited pages ; but the consequences matter. The inefficiency of Parliament, for it has come to that, and the quiet assertiveness and efficiency of the chiefs of the permanent Civil Service have brought changes of moment in the balance of the constitution and removed it still further from the ideal that sees in the House of Commons an assembly of the Wise Men of the Nation, a Witenagemot grown representative through the ages, conferring together fully and frankly on national questions, and applying to them such principles of justice, freedom, and security as have been won through hard necessity, the sense of right and firm will.

Well, circumstances have drifted a very long way from all that ; and, on the contrary, we see the methods of Parliament often confused, misused, and very wasteful. Precious hours are lost while dull men talk to empty benches ; bills sometimes containing vital principles are forced through brainlessly by means of the ' guillotine.' Some things are over-debated, while others, most necessary, are not debated at all. Once on a time there was every year a discussion in Supply on the salaried employment of a rat-catcher for Buckingham Palace—it was generally the first vote taken annually—and later in that as in every session millions of pounds concerning the,

often-debatable, well-being of the Empire would be passed as with the turning of a creaky handle because there was no more time. This is no exaggeration. Such mischievous absurdities were and are still frequent there. Yet what an abuse it is of the power, authority, and dignity of Parliament, the Mother of Parliaments, unequalled for the scope, height, and opportunities of its responsibilities ! There is, of course, far too much work for the House of Commons to do and too much in consequence must be left to every minister whose *ipse dixit* now is accepted as an instalment of the *vox populi* or it may be *vox Dei*, whereas often it is only a loud echo of the whispering of the permanent Civil Servant, the power behind. And a great deal of the work, though voluminous, is negligible comparatively, being the formal approval of local Bills relating to light railways, ferries, and such other small fry, which might be looked after more appropriately by the County Councils or by some delegated body based upon the elected County Councils—for we do not want any more direct elections ; while as to the greater questions involving a careful administrative policy by the departments, the thorough-going appointment of committees of members for investigation and the thrashing out of points, giving every individual definitely more to do of the responsible work of Parliament, would help to lighten the impossible load, would be valuable to the country by securing (let us hope) better consideration for measures before they are passed, and would give the member himself justification for the long hours he must spend at Westminster and the labour and personal expense he had been put to before getting there. Something anyhow must be done to restore to the Commons their efficiency.

We pass to the House of Lords, and its necessary reform ; a question baffling, partly because it is not faced. Nearly every state, large or small, in the world has a Second Chamber, and it would be an egregious folly if such a revising body as the House of Lords, which is also the Supreme Court of the Law, were abolished. But it will not be ended. We may feel comfortable over that. The Labour Party has proved somewhat too conservative for that sort of ruthlessness now to prevail. The old English unimaginative Radical had more dan-

gerous teeth. Yet mended it must be. But how? That, of course, is what Hamlet called the rub, and is not to be constructively answered in a few words here. The principle of life-peerages must certainly be accepted in any alteration made, and mere hereditary privileges must go, gradually or otherwise. The House of Lords, if it is to do imperial work and be a large-visioned revising body, must be representative and not directly elected; and surely it will number amongst its life-peers men who have done good service in the Dominions? The difficulties before us, it will be seen, even from these few words, are complicated and immense; while, doubtless, the spirit of controversy will have endless opportunity for using its gifts for obstructing and its many spiked tongues; but in the age of progress and organisation already upon us, things cannot be permitted to drift. Weighty and insistent problems are not solved by being left alone. They rather fester, and so spread the poisons of unrest and discontent through the body politic. Beyond that, also, the circumstances of the age—of the efficient forceful mechanistic age that is to be—are not of the kind that waits. To hesitate in the mending, the adapting, while there is time, might easily mean a bad ending.

It is, therefore, essential that our invaluable and ancient institution of Parliament in both its Houses should be examined sympathetically and dealt with constructively, reformed, improved, made workable, efficient, so that its abundant and supreme responsibilities may be well fulfilled. But not only in the Parliamentary machine is there a call for courageous alterations and adjustments if the nation is to keep its place in the front rank. The Law's delays must end; and this, it is understood from legal authorities, can be done by the appointment of more judges. Then, in the name of national efficiency, why not appoint them and let them get to work? It must be remembered that waste of means, time, and energy must be everywhere eliminated if we are to hold our own, and for months to drag by as they do before cases can be called and tried, with all the advantages that such dilatoriness may give to the parties in the wrong, is of the nature of an injustice. Bad methods everywhere are an extravagance, and nowhere are they more costly than in our time-ordained legal processes.

It seems, therefore, the more we look at the facts of our social and political life, that nearly everywhere there is occasion for prompt improvement or reform in preparation for future efforts; not reform of a revolutionary nature, nothing really destructive; but of the kind based on forethought and commonsense, which makes the instrument more effective, removes the inevitable occasional rust, 'lops the mouldered branch away.' In other words, it is the getting of all parts of the national machine, social, industrial, cultural, and spiritual, ready for profitable and triumphant work in a newly efficient age; and the sooner men of all parties come loyally to settle these purposes and discussions the better. In Agriculture, that great industry, surely there must be improvements available if sought for which the State in its ordered grandmotherliness could not be expected to provide! May there not be developments in dairy farming and profitable vegetable-growing and the opening of home markets even now untouched? And in business, manufacturing, mining? The railways with their falling passenger traffic and sad reductions of staff. The fishing industry. Why must that excellent food-supply be left so much to the traders and speculators with the result alleged that much which is caught is returned dead to the ocean because without such waste prices would fall? The fault here, as often elsewhere, must be largely one of distribution. So let the railways with their co-operating road-services look to it. What is lost in the first-class compartment may be made up in the goods-truck. In many villages throughout England, even near the coast, haddocks and herrings are not seen unless they are cured or past curing; but the market for such simple nourishing food as fish is illimitable, and its proper distribution and enjoyment would mean an actual increase in the standard of living of the whole people. The present wastefulness is unpardonable.

Beyond these suggested modifications, these passing reforms, these tinkering as they may appear—the tinker is a useful artisan if not exactly in place with a steam-engine—put down here as instances of what might be done, there is also the personal element, and that is paramount. It is not enough to improve the machine; the man who controls it must also look to his own fitness, readiness,

bodily and spiritual health ; for with all the miracle of its construction, ingenuity, and usefulness, the machine, a triumph of the practical, imaginative mind, is ever subject to the mind ; and that brings us to the most important element in the future strengthening and efficiency of the people—Education, well defined by Mr Everett Dean Martin in ' Whither Mankind ? ' as

' Something which will broaden the interests and sympathies of people regardless of their daily occupation—or along with it—to lift men's thought out of the monotony and drudgery which are the common lot, to free the mind from servitude and hard opinion, to train habits of judgment and of appreciation of value, to carry on the struggle for human excellence in our day and generation, to temper passion with wisdom, to dispel prejudice by better knowledge of self, to enlist all men, in the measure that they have capacity for it, in the achievement of civilisation ' (p. 360).

The achievement of civilisation ! It is that to which we must ever adapt ourselves, for whoever falls behind in that achievement, whether it be personal or national, a man or a people, is left behind to live among the ruins and the futile regrets. ' Civilisation may not crash,' says Mr Cole, ' but it trembles ; and men need in the quest of happiness a social background.' For happiness the word ' content ' would be sufficient, as contentment implies not only happiness but a full satisfaction which happiness alone does not imply. And by social background, we may take it that he means security. Possibly he would not accept this compact interpretation of his meaning, for both he and Mr J. A. Hobson have written elaborate volumes full of particular suggestions for a Socialist Government to carry into effect. Yet somehow the present Socialist Government seem not to have noticed them. Mr Hobson, for instance, would cure Unemployment by mobilising all the men out of work into Labour Corps, under leaders, with pay and rations, like the soldiers of an army, and put, as though in a warfare, to this national job, to that national job, until, it must be, the dawn of the impossible day when there will be no more unemployment and no more national jobs. We have no wish to deride honest suggestions, but the impracticability of that one is shown sufficiently

by the care with which Mr J. H. Thomas in his frenzied hunt for remedies has overlooked it.

The time, anyhow, has come for more vision and confidence in furthering the welfare of the whole of our imperial Commonwealth. Inspiration and organisation both are called for. Democracy has been on trial through difficult years and has neither failed nor richly succeeded. It has been hampered by many things—old faiths unsuited to new times, the slow and faulty methods of honourable institutions that need revision, a temporary unwillingness to risk adventure—was 'Safety First' really an inspiring war-cry?—and still more by the far-reaching consequences of the most devastating war in history, for which Democracy certainly was not to blame. And now, when the necessity for renewed effort is evident, we are challenged, it appears, to meet the highly exacting requirements of a mechanistic age in which every civilised nation is to be an increasingly efficient rival of all others. To fail in meeting and overcoming those requirements would mean that we were a tired people, effete, disheartened, incapable of rising to a great sudden critical call. 'Which is Absurd.' Dr Stratford-Wingfield's distinguished passenger, who stepped from the beaked galley of Hengist, and whose name was John Bull, has never yet finally failed in the task he was put to ; and the British race, the world over, will continue to secure its fair share of prosperity and the responsibilities that accompany leadership ; but we must pull ourselves together, and we must pull together ; and that—as the recent Empire Games at Hamilton in Canada bore happy witness—we shall do.

D. B. LLOYD.

Art. 7.—THE STAGE: YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND TO-MORROW.

THE Stage of yesterday! A fascinating theme. But the yesterday of whom? To elderly fogies, who retain some touch of their early passion for the theatre, the phrase might conjure up memories of the great Samuel Phelps. Not, indeed, of that peerless leader's triumphant reign at Old Sadler's Wells. The appreciative crowds that, for some seventeen years, thronged there to witness his notable presentment of nearly every one of Shakespeare's accepted plays, must all, by now, have passed over—despite the almost daily discovery of more and more authenticated centenarians. But, let us say, the Phelps of the pawky, wheezy, long-headed James I—adroitly doubled with the bedraggled but picturesque miser Trapbois—in Andrew Halliday's 'King o' Scots' at Old Drury. Or, yet again, the brave days when Hollingshead ruled at the original Gaiety, and brought Phelps, Charles Matthews, and J. L. Toole together in a memorable revival of Colman's 'John Bull.'

Far too ancient history, I fear, for even middle-aged stage votaries of to-day. What then of that brilliant light comedian, E. A. Sothern, whose Piccadilly-whiskered Lord Dundreary invariably spelt prosperity wherever he chanced to roam? Tom Robertson wrote 'Garrick' specially for him, as an opportunity to show his versatility; but that almost 'actor-proof' part was, later, virtually annexed and resolutely held on to by our own Charles Wyndham. Sothern for many subsequent years, and until his comparatively early death, found his great, and, indeed, only 'stand-by' in 'The Crushed Tragedian,' adapted for him by H. J. Byron from his own earlier 'Prompter's Box.' The throaty, raucous voice, which Sothern had to develop for this strenuous part, practically incapacitated him from attempting any different character; but, fortunately, as with Joe Jefferson's 'Rip,' the American play-going public wanted 'no other.'

Still among the 'fossils,' you see! May, then, we oldsters be allowed to speak admiringly of the Bancrofts' illustrious régime at their little Tottenham Court Road playhouse? the sprightly days of 'Society,' 'Ours,' 'School,' and never-fading 'Caste'? A joyous retro-

spect! What perfect acting!—‘tea-cup and saucer work,’ though it might be contemptuously labelled by envious competitors. The inimitable Polly of Marie Wilton, the stolid, monocled Hawtree of Squire Bancroft, the glib, warm-hearted Cockney gas-fitter of John Hare, and the never-to-be-equalled Eccles of George Honey. All gone. How soon and how completely forgotten is the actor! After the lamented death of James Albery in 1889, a benefit performance of his first, and greatest, success, ‘Two Roses,’ was announced to be given at the Vaudeville Theatre, then, as when the play was originally produced, under the management of James and Thorne. Honey, anxious to pay tribute to his old friend, at once offered to play ‘Our Mr Jenkins.’ In thanking him, Alport, the Vaudeville business manager, explained that the part had been assigned to Mr James, as a general wish had been expressed that all the members of the original cast should, if possible, appear in it. Honey duly pointed out that his reason for applying for the part was the fact that he had been its first representative; but, as that was now impossible, might he be allowed to walk on in the crowd? James only heard of his manager’s *faux-pas* on the day of the performance, and refused to go on. In the event ‘Our Mr Jenkins’ was played by Bradbury, the understudy, and the great George Honey came on as a villager in the last act. A touch of irony there!

Let us now break new ground, and turn to what was once hailed as an epoch-making *comédie des mœurs*, Tom Taylor and A. W. Dubourg’s ‘New Men and Old Acres’ at the old Court, with its delightful traditions of winsome, golden-voiced Ellen Terry—though many earnest playgoers are apt to forget that Dame Madge Kendal was the original representative, at the Haymarket, of the light-hearted, wayward Lilian Vavasour. It was during this Court engagement that the fair Ellen was wooed and won by Charles Kelly, who played Brown; and who never really looked up again after the mutual tie had been unhappily severed. Even as I write comes the sad news that Marion Terry, the last survivor of that wonderful quartette of sisters, has passed away. She had, to the full, that tear-compelling gift which always accompanied the Terry voice; but she also, unquestionably, possessed great versatility; though her manifest powers

of comedy were too seldom given their opportunity. Who, that saw it, could forget her famous exit as Belinda Treherne, in W. S. Gilbert's 'Engaged'? When, aroused to the fact that her matrimonial hopes had dwindled to extinction, she snatched up a tray of succulent viands, and defiantly marched off, with the consolatory phrase, 'Thank God! I can still eat!' Then, too, her anguished look—as Susan Throssell in 'Quality Street'—when one of her dwindling band of pupils brought the disconcerting news that a hard-headed father insisted on his daughter 'acquiring' algebra. The pathos of her helpless, extenuating plea, 'But, my dear, you are so *thin*.' A real Barrie touch, that! But she also shared that well-known weakness of the Terry family, on the spindle side—defective and treacherous memory. I have had the honour of playing Sir Peter to her Lady Teazle, and well remember the skill with which she would conceal her frequent lapses. Playfully unfurling her fan, and airily saying 'Oh! fie, Sir Peter,' she would get close to me, and softly whisper behind her silken shield, 'What's next?' But I never knew her to 'dry-up' in Lady Teazle's penitent appeal and tearful exit after her painful exposure in the Screen Scene.

Dame Madge Kendal once told me a little story which, while confirming the age-old feminine reluctance to accept the verdict of Time's 'moving finger,' conveys no thought of discourtesy to our departed friend.

'Marion called on me one day, and at once burst out with "Madge, I want work, really want it, and can hear of nothing. Can you help me?" "Well, dear," I said, "I'm sure you realise that our little touring repertoire would be of no use to you. But—ah! an idea. Charles Frohman is lunching with us to-morrow. Drop in just after one. I'll introduce you, and have a quiet word with him previously." After lunch I discreetly withdrew, and, as soon as Frohman had left, rejoined Marion, and simply said "Well?" "Oh! what a charming man, *charming! delightful!*" "Quite so, but have you *fixed* anything?" "Madge, dear, he offered me a long engagement, right away, at really splendid terms!" "Oh! then, that's all right," I said. "But, my dear Madge, it was for *grandes dames!* I couldn't possibly take it. I *must* play young parts. I can't give them up. The public accepts my sister Ellen in them, and she's years older than I." I put my

arm round her, Graham, and led her to that big mirror. "My dear Marion," I said, "we're both *grandes dames*. Nothing can alter that fact." But she wouldn't take Frohman's offer, though I could easily have explained her first refusal. Wasn't it Burns who said, "Oh! wad some power——"?

By an inscription on one of Hogarth's inimitable compositions we learn that the admiration a certain opera-singer had inspired found its full expression in the irreverent, blasphemous slogan, 'One God! One Farinelli!' While in no way presuming to paraphrase such absurd adulation, it may perhaps be permissible to point out that there has only been *one* Mrs Kendal. It is now twenty-one years since she voluntarily laid down her sceptre, and no worthy successor, in all-round excellence, has yet been evolved. Her acknowledged pre-eminence was strikingly impressed on me, as far back as 1887, in a chat with old Dick Younge, a celebrated actor and manager. I had asked who, in his opinion, was the finest actress of our time. His reply was brief but emphatic. Pointing with his stick to a framed lithograph of Mrs Kendal hanging on the wall, he quoted the racing aphorism, 'Eclipse first—the rest nowhere!'

Well, what about 'Our Boys,' with its 1875-1879 run of 1362 performances? or 'Charley's Aunt,' with 1466—and 'still running'—at any rate every Christmastide? or the almost unexplainable success of 'Chu Chin Chow'? It would, perhaps, be ungracious to inquire of cherubic Oscar Asche the why and wherefore of its phenomenal career of 2238 morning and evening shows? I doubt if he himself knows. It was good entertainment certainly; calling for little mental exertion; splendidly produced, with effective incidental music, and, of course, had fresh attractions periodically featured in it; but, I fancy, the original compiler of the Thousand and One Arabian Nights may still be wondering, in Mahomet's Paradise, how our old friend Ali Baba could have inspired so magnificent a re-incarnation?

May we pause a moment to pay tribute to the memory of Henry Irving? Surely still remembered by the majority of the play-going public? A quarter of a century has flown since his tragic ending, but no admitted successor has, as yet, laid claim to his dramatic heritage. Sir Johnston Forbes Robertson might have done so, and his

assumption of the fallen mantle would, I feel assured, have been universally welcomed. But I suspect a deep sense of loyalty to his former chief kept back all thought of self-advancement, and now, of course, he dwells among us in honourable retirement, happy, I feel sure, that the talent of his charming daughter will keep his memory green for many years to come.

The trail of 'laudator temporis acti' no doubt hangs over the preceding pages. I will not attempt to evade the impeachment. But as there were brave men before Agamemnon, so were there after him. To suggest that our stage is, in any sense, a moribund institution, would be a calumny. Many excellent actors are still with us. To name but a few, we may cite Mr Matheson Lang, a proven exemplar of strong character work; Mr Godfrey Tearle, who, from his performance in 'The Hypocrites' years ago, I felt convinced must become one of our most distinguished actors, though I fear he has, perhaps, let 'I dare not, wait upon I would' a thought too long. Mr Henry Ainley, whose noble Hamlet I hope I may live to see once more. The *tour de force* of Mr Robert Lorraine in 'The Father' will not readily be forgotten. Mr Lyn Harding has, I am told, played Macbeth, recently, throughout America for many months, and never missed a performance—a gallant essay. But I am sure that not one of these gentlemen—all trained under old-time conditions—able and accomplished as they are, would claim to possess the marked individuality, the personal magnetism, the distinctive charm of manner held to the end by our dear dead chief. So much for the old. Suppose we turn to the Stage of to-day.

Like Rosalind and Celia's 'faithful feeder,' Corin, our present-day stage is in 'a parlous state.' Most theatrical managers—with the possible exception of Mr C. B. Cochran—not only admit, but on sufficient grounds, can demonstrate that all is far from well with the industry they are supposed to direct. These worthy gentlemen may be conveniently divided into two camps: those whose energies are devoted to supplying the metropolis with dramatic entertainment; and their less fortunate brethren who must cater for the provinces. In this regard, London, mighty mother, can be no criterion of the condition of things theatrical throughout the country.

A community of some eight million souls, with, in addition, a substantial floating population of visitors, many of them definitely in search of amusement, can be trusted to take care of itself. If your play is good enough, there are sufficient play-goers to ensure it a satisfactory run. But outside the twenty-odd mile radius, a different state of things, almost everywhere, has to be faced. There are lions in the pathway of the provincial drama, with, unhappily, no 'Mr Greatheart, their guide,' to breathe into the ears of the managers the reassurance that 'The lions are chained.'

Thirty years ago I used to stand at my theatre-door in Birmingham, and watch the growing procession of cycles streaming by. None of them, alas! coming my way; all, like the priest and the Levite, passing by on the other side. An evil, but yet comparatively trivial. In due course, motor-cars began to whirl their possessors further afield; and the week-ending development tended everywhere to deplete further the Saturday night's receipts. Willett's 'Daylight Saving' Bill—though doubtless an inestimable boon to the toiling millions—by enabling cricket, tennis, boating, and kindred sports to be indulged in up to 'ten of the clock,' was another thorn in the flesh. But all these were outside influences, which we were powerless to control, or even to mitigate. The surprising and virtually not-to-be-explained all-round increase of salaries—even before the War—dealt the theatre a shrewd blow, and, this time, well below the belt; for it was in great measure caused by the ill-judged and reckless spirit of competition amongst the rival managers, carried to excess. In my recent book, 'An Old Stock-Actor's Memories,' I have cited an instance, which I will venture to repeat, as being germane to this topic. I was the first manager to offer Mr Wilkie Bard a pantomime engagement. His reputation is now, of course, in every sense, world-wide; but the first contract he signed with me was for 20*l.* weekly. Three years afterwards I gave him 60*l.* Three years after that, 150*l.*; and his last pantomime contract to play in the same theatre was for 300*l.* a week, plus another 300*l.* for the usual fortnight's rehearsal. Further comment is, I think, unnecessary. As Jack Bunsby would have remarked to his old friend Cap'n Cuttle, 'The bearings of this observa-

tion lays in the application on it.' Abreast of this inflation of salaries came the expansion of theatre rents; mainly, of course, affecting Metropolitan playhouses. Rack-renting has since been carried to an almost incredible extent. Leases, originally fixed at a moderate but mutually satisfactory rental of, say, some fifty, or less, pounds a week, have, by a vicious system of subletting, been swollen to the audacious figure of, in many cases, over 400*l*. However, the erection of new theatres, now rising on all sides, will doubtless to some extent mitigate this oppressive brigandage.

But the most smashing blow as yet given to the theatrical industry has been, of course, delivered by the modern cinema. This disastrous development of the old 'Zoetrope,' or 'Wheel of Life,' which, as a boy, I remember seeing at the Crystal Palace in the early sixties, has, theatrically speaking, brought something like ruin in its train in every direction. I am afraid, too, that, to some extent, managers, in general, have to blame themselves for not foreseeing its destructive possibilities. Almost the first film shown over here was, I fancy, one depicting the memorable fight between J. J. Corbett, the San Francisco bank-clerk, and Bob Fitzsimmons, the Cornish blacksmith. I happened to be in Chicago soon after the fight had been arranged. At a base-ball ground I saw Corbett occupying a private box in the front tier. Just before the game was due to start Fitzsimmons entered, accompanied by his wife. As 'Fitz' made his way to his seat he was generally recognised, and something unusual—at all events where a Briton is concerned—transpired. The crowd burst into a lusty chorus of 'Raahs!' The black scowl of hatred which suffused Corbett's face fully assured me that, whenever it happened, the fight would be a 'needle' one,—as it was, though Fitzsimmons won, and, as is rather unusual nowadays, not on a foul. The film of the contest shown in England was a very blotchy, speckled, flickering affair, ruinous to any eyesight, and theatrical people, generally, were perhaps justified in not regarding it, in any sense, as a menace. But later came 'The Birth of a Nation.' A faultless revelation. Perfect photography, of wonderful spectacular interest, and, withal, steady as a rock. Were any steps taken to counteract such a formidable

antagonist? No! The walls of Old Drury were promptly opened, and the enemy comfortably installed therein. Later on I asked several fellow-members of the Theatrical Managers' Association if any plan to circumvent, or in any way check the 'moving-picture' opposition had been devised? but was airily assured there was no need to worry over the matter. One important manager spoke of it as 'a mere passing craze, just like skating-rinks; I give them eighteen months.' 'But, my good sirs,' I urged, 'have you watched its development abroad? I'm just back from Naples. I went one night to the biggest cinema there. I should think it held nearly 3000; crammed to the doors, and the highest charge 60 *centissimi*, less than 6d.! How can we fight such prices if they obtain over here?' 'Well, what do you suggest?' I was asked. 'I think,' I said, 'that if every one of us were to install a machine in our theatres, and give our audiences the best pictures we can secure'—and there was no monopoly in those days—'during the half-hour "early-door" period, and, possibly, also through the entr'actes, cinema speculators might hesitate to build new and expensive halls, while every theatre was giving the public pictures for nothing. I reckon we might almost save the cost of the films in gas. At present we have to keep our front lights full on, to let our 'early-door' patrons read about "all the winners" and the "soccer" teams for Saturday.' I didn't make a single convert. All sorts of objections were rained upon me. The insurance rates would be raised. The fire-brigades would oppose! The licensing magistrates would be sure to veto any such scheme. One would always be at the mercy of one's operator—another expense—who might get drunk at any moment; and so on. 'Well, gentlemen,' I said, 'I'm going to try it.' And I did. I bought a 'Pathé' machine, at a high price certainly, but I found great advantages from its installation; and got some excellent effects with it in every subsequent pantomime.

I am afraid that my confrères' tame acceptance of the inevitable was, in some cases, dictated by the wish to have a hidden film flutter 'on their own'; on the good old principle that what they lost on the roundabouts they might possibly make up on the swings. I have a vivid recollection of a complimentary luncheon given to a

prominent London manager, on the eve of his departure for America. The guest of honour was late in arriving. Cocktails were not then much in evidence, but a fair amount of brown sherry was consumed before the proceedings commenced. At the conclusion of the announced programme, the late J. B. Mulholland, a 'broth of a North Ireland bhoy,' always spoiling for a fight, sprung a surprise by calling on the company to drink an extra special toast to our guest, because, as he put it, in despite of Sir Herbert Tree having filmed his production of Henry VIII, and several other London managers having unblushingly gone over to the enemy, our guest of the afternoon had never 'bowed the knee to Baal.' The rather embarrassed acknowledgment of the compliment which followed, was, I fear, quietly enjoyed by such of us who knew that the delayed arrival of our guest had been caused by the unexpected slowness of the operators in filming him that very morning in one of his most recent successes.

Our London stage, for many years now, has suffered from an almost continuous spate of sex-problem, sex-mania, and sex-perversive plays, many of them by responsible authors who really might have been expected to know better. What a far cry from the days of the relentless prohibition of the younger Dumas' 'Camille'! Though, with our customary English predilection for compromise, we managed, somehow, to swallow the pill when presented in operatic form as 'La Traviata.' Then, too, one can readily conceive the early Victorian prejudice that shrank from permitting Shelley's 'Cenci' to be publicly performed. Despite its poetic glamour, the *motif* can only be classed as repulsive. Yet I feel sure that, as far back as 1890, an unbowdlerised version was performed at an old Strand *matinée*. When the Emperor Vespasian had made a praiseworthy attempt to apply a partial and very primitive system of drainage to the patrician quarter of ancient Rome, his son Titus, evidently a bit of a 'highbrow,' is reported to have reproached his sire for securing a personal and strictly private profit from its development. The old gentleman, we are told, at once drew a handful of coins from his pouch, applied them to his nose, and quietly remarked, 'Non olet'—'It doesn't smell.' This seems to have been

the guiding principle of the writers and producers of the dramatic garbage with which we have, of late, been made so painfully familiar. Given the extreme laxity in sexual association that obtains to-day; our newspapers flooded, more or less, with advertisements imparting ample details of how any unfortunate consequence can be avoided, whatever licence may have been indulged in; it does not require abnormal foresight to predict a state of society in which there will be far more Potiphar's wives than Lucretias.

In the days of the Regency, Sir Samuel Garth, M.D., was extolled for having, as it was phrased, 'brought Ovid into the drawing-room.' His version, loftily dedicated to the Princess of Wales—afterwards Queen Caroline—in spite of his mildly deodorising treatment—positively reeks of the cess-pool. Licentious literature, however, is one thing; its presentation on the stage, with living exemplars, is another; and it is pleasant to record that, thanks to the stand taken by many of our dramatic critics, prominently by our esteemed friend 'Carados,' of the 'Referee,' there has been of late an abatement of the polluting flood. Provincial audiences have always treated this particular kind of dramatic fare from what may perhaps be termed a more Puritanical point of view. So mild a case as Sir Arthur Pinero's notable play 'The Profligate,' produced at the Garrick in 1889, was looked at askance very early in its provincial tour. Even its original exponents failed to make the dish palatable. This unusual circumstance was, personally, borne in upon me when the wife of Mr Rickards, a well-known stage peruquier, tearfully told me that my wig was not ready, as her husband had had to rush off to Manchester to make Mr Hare up for his old part in 'Mamma,' which play the poor reception given to 'The Profligate' had caused to be put on at a moment's notice.

Another calamitous issue has been the practical extinction of the London actor-manager. Up to recent years many of the leading Metropolitan theatres were in the hands of popular stage personalities, who had, almost without exception, justified their positions by long years of faithful public service. Each theatre, so held, had its devoted followers who supported their favourites, not only by their attendance, but by earnest recommendation

—the best of all forms of theatrical advertisement—and, not infrequently, thereby ensured the success of plays that had originally suffered at the hands of Press censors. Naturally the almost absolute rule of the actor-manager led to occasional abuse. Their syndicated opponents were ever ready to exaggerate any case of personal grievance that came to their knowledge. Disappointed playwrights were prone to allege neglect, discourtesy, rudeness, the undue retention and even loss of manuscripts. Quite possibly, even with an accepted play, before reaching its rehearsal stage, the personal 'star' might point out to the author that the parts of both the male and female artists playing opposite to him were a bit too 'lime-lightish,' and would bear compression; and perhaps might even suggest that to excise some of their most effective lines would not be really to lose their value, as with a little alteration they could be easily fitted into his own rôle. Theatrical gossip, during the Adelphi run of 'Harbour Lights,' gave credit to a rumour that Bill Terriss, as the nautical hero, boldly annexed a number of lines originally spoken in the play by a weather-beaten old 'salt'; which, however, while appropriate to their proper setting, lost much of their significance by being transplanted. Nearly all the actor-managers have passed away; but, I believe, the profession, as a body, would welcome their resuscitation, were such a miracle possible.

A salutary reform, and one which should be easily effected, would be the correction of the tendency of so many of our modern artists to subdue their voices on the stage almost to inaudibility. Sitting in the front row of stalls, on the wood-wind side for choice, it is still quite usual to miss much of the unfolding of the plot through the 'refaned,' drawing-room delivery of many of our present-day actors, who, apparently, have never discovered, or had pointed out to them, the obvious fact that when speaking 'up stage' it is necessary almost to double the volume of sound, without, of course, betraying the effort. The most perfect musical instrument is, as we are often assured, the human voice; but, like other instruments, it requires drill and exercise. The first lesson impressed on stage novices in the old days was—'You've got to be *heard*, young fellow. They've paid their money in front to hear you. So plug it well up

against the 'No Smoking' in the gallery, and don't drop your voice till you're back in your dressing-room.'

But such plain-spoken instruction would, to-day, only be scoffed at in our Dramatic Academies. The time-honoured names of Barry Sullivan, Charles Dillon, or Charles Calvert are dismissed as 'ranter,' 'barnstormers'; and we are assured that better effects are secured by a clearly thought-out, psychological study of 'character,' presented with a natural, well-ordered restraint. It may be so; but of this I am sure, that Edmund Kean would never have uttered his famous retort, 'Damn Lord Essex; the pit rose at me,' if his Shylock had not been given with all the fire and intensity of that old school, whose precepts we are to-day being led to despise. 'Reserved force' is not, however, exclusively a modern failing. Not all our old-time actors and actresses were 'loud speakers.' I remember, when W. S. Gilbert was 'Fun's' dramatic critic, his quoting a passage in a play as delivered by a prominent leading actress: 'He is my mumble mumble, and I love him mumbly. My very mumble mumble mumble and my only mumble mumble.' A story once was told of a performance at Old Sadler's Wells, in which a stentorian Richard III persistently addressed Catesby, his trusty retainer, as *Catsby*. This particular artist happened to possess a very weak voice, and, in the final act, when the 'flying messages' were coming in 'thick as tale,' to be, through the feeble elocution of the emissary, almost inaudible; an exasperated galleryite felt compelled to shout, 'D'ye hear! *Mew* a bit louder, *Catsby*.'

Broadcasting has not, on the whole, proved the deadly foe it at one time threatened to be. Its early history portended disaster to almost every branch of our business. The concert platform, in particular, seemed doomed beyond hope. Quick to foresee its dangers, Mesdames Melba and Clara Butt promptly refused, in any way, to encourage the novelty. Messrs Chappell, with equal readiness, announced their intention of discontinuing their popular Queen's Hall programmes. But the opposition died down. It was found impossible to withstand the enormous wave of enthusiasm with which the marvellous invention was everywhere received. Some optimists in the theatre even anticipated an increase of business as the

result of their giving excerpts from their repertory. But they soon woke up. Any one who has listened to the 'studio' reading of any kind of play, or to the laboured efforts of variety artists, endeavouring to be funny to nobody, may have sincerely pitied the unseen executants, but would certainly not think of paying for a repetition.

Vigorous and justifiable complaints have been launched against the enormous volume of 'canned' music which of late has forced thousands of musicians to swell the already overflowing ranks of the unemployed. This is, however, only a side issue of the general trouble, and is, I fancy, not wholly deplored by the average theatrical director, who, for a considerable number of years—since the foundation of the Amalgamated Musicians' Union—has had to dance to the piping of that Union's determined tune, much as the unhappy Starkey, in 'Peter Pan,' was forced to obey the harsh commands of his Red Indian captors. The orchestra has ever been a source of managerial worry. Gilbert struck a sympathetic note when, in 'The Gondoliers,' he made the Duchess of Plaza-Toro say, as a comment on their solitary drummer's ultimatum, 'Oh! how like a band!'

Long years ago the importance of orchestral assistance to the average play was barely recognised. In many provincial theatres, beyond the actual conductor and his leader, both usually competent musicians, the balance of the performers in the orchestra followed some workaday calling—bootmaking, weaving, carpentering, or other similar trades, and, like the shilling-a-night supernumeraries, could only give a solitary mid-day Monday rehearsal. The local conductor might be handed a formidable list of music cues, and 'melos' to be taken up during performance; but in practice it mostly was condensed into 'eight bars of "hurry" till the hero gets well down stage' or 'a bit of "mysterious" while I'm at work on the safe'; 'A double chord at each "cross" in the broadsword fight.' Or the leading lady might ask for 'just a little piano, you know, when I come on with the child.' That, and the ability to open with the 'Zampa' or 'Light Cavalry' overture was all that was expected. This sort of thing in recent years has been 'reformed altogether'; but whenever orchestral organisation has felt it had a giant's strength, it has never scrupled

to 'use it as a giant.' And that is why in London theatres to-day, except for musical shows, three or four musicians constitute the orchestra; and in some houses only 'canned' music is supplied.

'What will to-morrow bring, who can tell?' was the opening line of a once popular ballad. As regards the future of the British stage the outlook looks equally uncertain. We appear to have reached a state of affairs which the author of the Bigelow Papers long ago described as 'fronting South by North.' Of one impending consequence there can be no doubt. The opposition of the 'Talkies' will be on a more devastating scale than ever. What further marvels 'television' may have in store we cannot guess; but we may safely conjecture that whatever countless millions of dollars can do in that direction will be done, whoever may have to find them. However many millions may be sunk or gambled away, this is sure, that another armoured-car or so will be launched against the dispirited ranks of poor old Thespis.

Theatres certainly are rising everywhere: vast auditoriums, designed to accommodate some three to four thousand sightseers. But any inquiry will probably elicit the significant fact that whatever form of amusement may be announced for the opening of these mammoth palaces, the precaution of wiring them for conversion into 'talkie' homes will in no case have been overlooked.

I fear, alas! that hope of a National Theatre, the evolution of which has been dreamt of for years, must be abandoned. The sum required for a suitable site and an adequate structure alone, is too vast to be raised by voluntary subscription; and as a speculative investment the scheme would make no appeal to City capitalists. Nor, if built, could it be successfully run, on a worthy scale, without a substantial Governmental subsidy. The attitude, in such case, of our present rulers may be surmised from their continued refusal to remove the harassing Amusement Tax—originally imposed as a War measure—which presses so heavily on our declining industry. We are told we have no ground of complaint as the tax falls wholly on the public. No regard is given to the fact that its infliction keeps many thousands of playgoers away from the theatre box-offices. Some few years back, during the first Socialist government, Mr

Stephen Walsh, then Secretary for War, was good enough to say at a theatrical luncheon that he thought the tax a grievance, and would see what he could do to get it repealed. Great jubilation hailed his kindly announcement. I was mildly sceptical. Asked why I doubted the speaker's good faith, I took refuge in Scriptural analogy: "Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?" Mr Walsh's pledge is, I'm sure, just for vote-catching. A Socialist government will only throw sops to its own supporters, the many-headed Cerberus. I was right. The ultimate paltry concession on seats costing 6d., or less, has only benefited the low-priced cinema and the football grounds, two of our severest competitors. Indeed, to look for any genuine relief in this respect is to possess a super-optimism akin to that of the impecunious bon-vivant, who is reported to have ordered an expensive meal, at an exclusive restaurant, on the strength of the valuable pearl he hoped to find in the oysters with which he proposed to begin. I do not wish it to be thought that my predictions of evil days to come spring willingly from my pen. But no spirit of false optimism can be of use to the provincial theatre. We must be 'up and doing' all over the country-side.

We have yet a few arrows left in our quiver, and can say, with Bolingbroke, 'I see some sparks of better hope, which elder years may happily bring forth.' There are theatres in the provinces, mostly in northern districts, which, I am told, by returning to old stock methods, are holding the enemy at bay, with increasing prospects of ultimate success. I have great faith in this reversion to old-time usages. Sir Barry Jackson has, time and again, proved at Birmingham that a permanent stock company, in continual residence, may make theatrical history. Neither do I doubt that Mr Alfred Denville—whose generous, practical sympathy has brought happiness and comfort to many unfortunate members of our profession in their declining years—could give some interesting facts as to the possibilities of good 'stock' companies. In every large provincial town there should be the same opportunity. But, of course, the actors and actresses must be competent, experienced, and adaptable. They will want some finding, but yet are to be got—despite the continuous exodus of the leading spirits to Hollywood.

Capable producers are vital, but of these the supply is limited. Above all, no fantastic salaries will be possible. Given these conditions: Plays carefully selected, well cast, adequately mounted, and thoroughly well rehearsed—and with a moderate treasury list—I do not think the issue would be long in doubt. Local play-goers would soon take an interest in the work of the artists settled in their midst. Monotony, after a fairly long season, could be avoided by an exchange of company—either partial or *en bloc*—with other towns. Efficient production is, however, a *sine qua non*. A *real* producer should be able to demonstrate to each member of his company just how every action, movement, or gesture should be made, and, if necessary, how each phrase of dialogue should be delivered.

It is very pleasant to be able to record that considerable success has been achieved, on a pro-rata commonwealth basis, at the Duke of York's Theatre; where 'The Way to treat a Woman' is still playing to excellent business. But, as I have said, London is large enough to give every play its chance. That often reorganised band of players 'The Co-optimists' have conclusively proved, more than once, that excellent business can result from combined talent, intelligently presented. But a strong directing hand is of paramount importance. Without it, cliqueism, jealousies, friction, and oft-recurring crises are bound to come. Human Nature sees to that.

In conclusion, to put our theatrical house in order, three vital abuses, at least, must be vigorously dealt with. The excessive salaries which now prevail must be brought within reasonable limits. Exorbitant, paralysing rentals must follow suit, and our prices of admission must undergo drastic revision. With regard to this last evil, there is no doubt that, emulating 'the fault of the Dutch,' as chronicled in Canning's whimsical couplet, we have, for too long a period, been 'giving too little and asking too much.' While, unquestionably, unable to meet the cinemas in this respect on anything like equal terms, considerable reductions and ameliorations are practicable; and have been successfully instituted for some time at the Winter Garden and other important theatres.

JOE GRAHAM.

Art. 8.—'THE SOVIET UNION AND PEACE.'

The Soviet Union and Peace: the Most Important of the Documents issued by the Government of the U.S.S.R. concerning Peace and Disarmament, from 1917 to 1929. With an Introduction by Henri Barbusse. Martin Lawrence, 1930.

THERE is a varied and extensive literature upon the Soviet Union which is surprisingly comprehensive considering its short existence; this literature is composed mainly of the observations and conclusions of friends or foes of the Soviet, or else it is the apologia of those who, like Trotski, have been expelled from their Eden by colleagues who are stronger than they. Such books shed light upon various stages and passages in the Soviet's development, and are all interesting, and to an extent valuable, as darts piercing through a censorship far stricter than anything known to history since that of Inquisition days; but they are necessarily restricted by the terms of their enquiry or their aim. M. Barbusse's book, therefore, has a positive and unique value in that it gives us, in their own words carefully chosen for public use, the Soviet Union's various declarations upon matters relating to domestic and international peace; and it should be studied carefully in the light of the Soviet's policy as expressed in actions of which the whole world is necessarily aware. Making its appearance almost simultaneously with the resumption of Anglo-Soviet diplomatic relations—an event described by the Soviet press as 'a victory of Soviet diplomacy fraught with colossal revolutionary importance . . . the mere fact of the re-establishment of normal diplomatic relations will facilitate the strengthening of our international proletarian connections,' (vide 'Times,' Oct. 8, 1929)—it yet passed practically unnoticed by our own press, full as that was of comment and speculation on the subject. We owe to M. Barbusse (at least, his is the only name that appears on the title-page) a most illuminating and interesting book which no student of his own times can afford to neglect. In this brief enquiry into these documents, we shall leave them to speak for themselves, restricting our own comments as much as possible.

'There can hardly be a single State,' M. Barbusse tells us in his long explanatory Introduction,

'whose history is so full of endeavours for the effective establishment of peace throughout the world as is the eleven years' history of the Soviet Union. . . . From its first decree "On Peace" (issued on the morrow of its coming into power) to its adherence to the Kellogg Pact, the Soviet Union has struggled for peace with remarkable persistence and inexhaustible energy. . . . The history of these efforts is a remarkable one, and worthy of attentive study as well as closer acquaintance. . . . All the most important stages in the peace activities of the Soviet Union . . . are equally rich in new formulæ, original suggestions, and exhaustive projects' (pp. 1, 2). 'The Soviet Union, despite opposition, is always looking for ways of strengthening peace and eliminating the danger of war between nations. The Soviet Government practises an extensive system of friendly and non-aggressive treaties and agreements that are entirely in the interests of the nations adhering to them. The 1921 treaties with Persia and with Turkey testify to the exclusively peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union, tearing up and annulling all secret treaties made by Tsarist Russia with other Imperialist States, while the agreement of May 31, 1924, between the Soviet Union and China, on a basis of perfect equality on either side, corroborated the Soviet Union's renunciation of all special privileges and rights achieved by the Tsarist Government in China by means of war and violence. . . . In the whole eleven years' history of the Soviets no step has been taken that was not directed towards the effective realisation of peace.' (Intro., pp. 18, 20.)

With minds thus prepared by M. Barbusse, we turn to the actual documents shed upon the world at close intervals by the Soviet Union, as it steps heavenward.

'Appeal by the Council of People's Commissars for the R.S.F.S.R. to the Peoples of the Belligerent Countries with proposals to join in the negotiations for an armistice, Petrograd, Nov. 28, 1917. . . . The victorious Workers' and Peasants' Revolution in Russia has brought the question of peace into the forefront of world attention. The period of vacillations, delays, and red-tape agreements is over. Now all Governments, all classes, all parties, in the belligerent countries are called upon to give a plain answer to the question: "Do you agree to join us on December 1st in negotiations for an immediate armistice and general peace?" . . .

We appeal to the allied peoples and first and foremost to their toiling masses. . . . We demand that the labour parties in the allied countries give an immediate answer to the question: "Do they want to open peace negotiations on December 1st?"

A plain question has been put! Soldiers, proletarians, toilers, peasants! Do you want to join us in a decisive step towards a people's peace? . . . Such a peace can only be concluded by means of a direct and courageous struggle of the revolutionary masses against all Imperialist plans and aggressive aspirations. The Workers' and Peasants' Revolution has already declared its peace programme. . . . The Government of the Victorious Revolution does not require recognition from the professional representatives of capitalist diplomacy, but we do ask the people: "Does reactionary diplomacy express your ideals and aspirations?" . . . The answer to these questions must be given without delay, and it must be an answer in deeds and not merely in words. The Russian Army and the Russian People cannot and will not wait longer. On December 1st we shall begin peace negotiations' (pp. 26, 27).

To the slower wits of the Old World it may seem unfortunate that the Soviet Government should have allowed but one full day—Nov. 30—for their appeal to reach the toiling masses of the belligerent countries, and for the toiling masses to consider and reply to so momentous a question, if a reply were really wanted.

'Appeal to all Mohammedan Workers in Russia and the East, Dec. 7, 1917.—Comrades! Brothers! Great events are occurring in Russia! An end is drawing near to the murderous war, which arose out of the bargainings of foreign powers. The rule of the plunderers, exploiting the peoples of the world, is trembling. The ancient citadel of slavery and serfdom is cracking under the blows of the Russian Revolution. . . . A new world is arising, a world of the toiler and the liberated. . . . The power in the country (Russia) is in the hands of the people. The toiling masses of Russia burn with the single desire to achieve an honest peace and help the oppressed people of the world to win freedom. . . . The mighty summons to freedom emitted by the Russian Revolution has aroused all the toilers in the East and West. . . . The workers and soldiers of the World are already rallying round the banner of Socialism, storming the strongholds of Imperialism. Even far-off India, that land which has been oppressed by the European "torch-bearers of civilisation"

for so many centuries, has raised the standard of revolt, organising its councils of deputies, throwing the hated yoke of slavery from its shoulders, and summoning the people of the East to the struggle for freedom. . . . The ground is slipping from under the feet of the imperialist pillagers. . . . Mohammedans of Russia, all you whose mosques and shrines have been destroyed, whose faiths and customs have been violated by the Tsars and oppressors of Russia! Henceforward your faith and your customs, your national and cultural departments, are declared free and inviolable! Organise your national life freely and unimpeded. It is your right. Know that your rights, like those of all the peoples of Russia, will be guarded by the might of the revolution and its organs, the Councils of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies! . . . Mohammedans of the East! Persians, Turks, Arabs, and Indians! All you whose bodies and property, freedom and native land have been for centuries exploited by the European beasts of prey! All you whose countries the plunderers who began the war now desire to share among themselves.'

Here follow declarations that the Tsarist treaties for 'the annexation of Constantinople,' 'the division of Persia,' 'the division of Turkey and the subduction from it of Armenia,' are now 'null and void.'

'Overthrow these robbers and enslavers of your lands! Now when war and ruin are breaking down the pillars of the world, when the whole world is burning with indignation against the imperialist brigands, when the least spark of indignation bursts out in a mighty flame of revolution, when even the Indian Mohammedans, oppressed and tormented by the foreign yoke, are rising in revolt against their slave-drivers—now it is impossible to keep silent! Lose no time in throwing off the yoke of the ancient oppressors of your land! Let them no longer violate your hearths! You must yourselves be masters in your own land! You yourselves must arrange your life as you yourselves see fit! You have the right to do this, for your fate is in your own hands! Comrades! Brothers! Advance firmly and resolutely towards an honest, democratic peace! We bear the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the world on our banners! Mohammedans in Russia! Mohammedans in the East! We look to you for sympathy and support in the work of renewing the world!' (pp. 28-30).

The promise to the Mohammedans of Russia that the

Soviet Government will uphold their 'faiths and customs, their national and cultural departments,'—whatever that may mean—is interesting as being the sole engagement to respect and protect religion of any sort which these documents contain. Such protection was not extended towards Christianity, even at the beginning. A French Socialist, M. Henri Béraud, who visited Russia in 1926 on a mission of enquiry, quotes the Soviet's own statistics in his book, 'Ce que j'ai vu à Moscou,' from which authoritative source we learn that in the nine years between its accession to power and the publication of his book (1917–1926), the Soviet Government had put to death 28 bishops, 1219 priests, 9000 doctors, 6000 teachers, also 54,000 officers and 260,000 rank-and-file, 7000 police, 193,000 workmen, 815,000 peasants, and 355,250 'intellectuals.' These numbers exceed by over 600,000 Great Britain's losses in the War; they must also have been greatly increased by the intensive war carried on against Christianity by the Anti-God Society and kindred organisations in the three years that have elapsed between the publication of M. Béraud's book and that of M. Barbusse. But—'The Soviet Union has struggled for peace with remarkable persistence and inexhaustible energy,' M. Barbusse assures us.

Having planted the germ of peace in the Mohammedan workers throughout the world, the Soviet Government addressed its next appeal to the 'Toiling, Oppressed, and Exhausted Peoples of Europe' (Dec. 19, 1917).

'We do not attempt to conceal the fact that we do not consider the existing capitalist Governments capable of a democratic peace. Only the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses against the existing Governments can bring Europe nearer to such a peace. Its full realisation can only be guaranteed by the victorious proletarian revolution in all capitalist countries. The Council of People's Commissars, while entering into negotiations with the existing Governments, penetrated as are both sides with imperialist tendencies, has never for a moment turned from the path of social revolution. A true democratic people's peace will still have to be struggled for. The first round in the struggle finds in power, everywhere except in Russia, the old monarchist and capitalist Governments. . . . We are forced to begin negotiations with those Governments which still exist at the present moment.

... In negotiating for peace the Soviet Government has set itself a double task ; first, to achieve the speediest possible cessation of the shameful and criminal slaughter which is laying Europe waste ; second, to assist with all the means at our disposal the working class in all lands to overthrow the sway of capital and to seize State power for the purpose of a democratic and socialistic reconstruction of Europe and the whole of humanity. ... Are the peoples willing to go on patiently enduring the criminal work of Stock Exchange cliques in France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States ? ... We summon you to this struggle, workers of all countries ! There is no other way. ... The workers and soldiers must tear the affairs of war and peace from the criminal hands of the bourgeoisie and take them into their own hands. ... Such is the only path to salvation for you *and for us* ' (pp. 30-33. Our italics).

Did these appeals from the Soviet Government to the peoples of Sovereign States over the heads of their rulers receive the reply they demanded and desired with such energy ? Not from the soldiers, certainly, who were too busy fighting to win a peace which many of them would not live to see ; but from a little group of persons who are not to be described as either ' toiling ' or ' oppressed.' In June 1917, the British Socialist Party had met in conference at Leeds, and it seemed to them that ' whatever genius or capacity for organisation is in the forces represented at Leeds must be devoted to the task of co-ordinating and directing the manifold discontents now growing in this country.' They ' demanded the complete charter of social, political, and economic liberty won by Russia.'* ' Now is the turn of the people,' said Mr Ramsay MacDonald, addressing the meeting. ' We must lay down our own terms, make our own proclamations, establish our own diplomacy.' The meeting passed a resolution

' demanding the establishment " at once in every town, urban district, and rural district (of) Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates for initiating and co-ordinating working-class activity in support of the policy set out in the foregoing resolutions, and to work strenuously for a peace made by the peoples of the various countries, and for the complete political and economic emancipation of international labour." The conveners of the conference—Jowett, Lansbury, MacDonald,

* 'The Call,' June 7, 1917.

Smillie, Williams, and others—were appointed there and then a provisional committee to supervise the formation of the local "Soviets"; and communications were to be addressed to the Secretary, "Workers' and Soldiers' Council." * *

Meetings followed, frequently rushed by angry soldiers and others; and eventually 'D.O.R.A.' sat down on the budding British Soviets and smothered them in her voluminous skirts.

Bankruptcy was the first of the problems which faced the Soviet Government. At the First Plenary Session of the Peace Conference of Brest-Litovsk (Dec. 22, 1917), the Soviet delegates named six points as a basis of peace negotiations with Germany, the fifth of which stated that 'none of the belligerent countries (was) to be bound to pay other countries so-called "war-costs"; contributions already paid to be returned. With regard to compensation of losses of private persons suffering from the War, such to be paid from a special fund formed by proportional levies from all the belligerent countries' (p. 38). This statement, when examined, means exactly—nothing; one may describe 'war costs' as 'compensation of private losses,' or as 'special funds,' or as 'proportional levies' (proportional to what?), but these are only different ways of spelling war costs, which are reparations.

We come to August 1918. 'Note from the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs to the Toiling Masses of England, America, France, Italy, and Japan. The whole capitalist press of your Countries howls like a vicious unleashed dog for the intervention of your Governments in Russian affairs, shouting loudly "Now or never!" . . . Anglo-Russian bandits are already executing Soviet workers on the Murman Railway, which they have seized' (p. 41). We were under the impression that a vicious dog, when unleashed, ceased to howl, 'Now or never!' but seized the auspicious moment and bit; but the picture is original and highly coloured in invective. Without giving the toiling masses of the Allied Countries time to respond to these overtures, M. Chicherin writes (Aug. 6, 1918) to Mr D. C. Poole, the United States Consul in Moscow, explaining why his Government, in the interests of international peace, has interned the nationals

* 'Labour in Transition,' by W. A. Orton, p. 104.

of certain foreign countries in concentration camps on Russian territory. 'We regard these nationals,' he writes, naïvely enough,

'as civilian prisoners. We apply these precautionary measures only against the members of the property classes, who are our opponents. No such measures are taken against our natural allies, the working men of these same countries, who happen to be here.' (p. 47). 'We ask you now,' he continues, 'if you cannot tell us plainly what Great Britain wants with us. Is Great Britain's aim to destroy the most popular Government the world has ever seen, namely, the Councils of the Poor and the Peasants? Is her aim a counter-revolution? . . . Or does she contemplate seizing any special town or territory we can name? Remembering your kindness, I hope you will help us to elucidate these problems' (p. 48).

M. Chicherin, indeed, appears to be one of Nature's wags. To President Wilson he writes on Oct. 24, 1918:

'Our trials helped to create a strongly united and disciplined Red Army, which is daily growing stronger and more powerful, and which is learning to defend the Revolution. . . . You refuse to conclude an armistice unless Germany will stop the outrages, pillaging, etc., during the evacuation of occupied territories. We allow ourselves therefore to draw the conclusion that you and your Allies will order the Czecho-Slovaks to return part of our gold reserve fund which they seized in Kazan, and that you will forbid them to continue as heretofore their acts of pillaging and outrage against the workers and peasants during their forced departure (for we will encourage their speedy departure, without waiting for your orders). . . . Is not the American Government a Government of American Corporations, of the American industrial, commercial, and railroad trusts, of the American banks—in short, a Government of the American capitalists? . . . However, Mr President, since we do not at all desire to wage war against the United States, even though your Government has not yet been replaced by a Council of People's Commissars and your post is not yet taken by Eugene Debs, whom you have imprisoned: since we do not at all desire to wage war against England, even though the Cabinet of Mr Lloyd George has not yet been replaced by a Council of People's Commissars with McLean at its head: since we have no desire to wage war against France, even though the capitalist Government of Clemenceau has not yet been replaced by a

workmen's Government of Merheim: just as we have concluded peace with the imperialist Government of Germany with Emperor Wilhelm at its head, whom you, Mr President, hold in no greater esteem than we, the Workmen's and Peasants' Revolutionary Government, hold you—we finally propose to you, Mr President, that you take up with your Allies the following questions, and give us precise and business-like replies (etc.)' (pp. 55, 56).

By 1922 the spectre of bankruptcy is haunting persistently the most popular Government the world has ever seen; the old Governments refuse recognition of a system which is built upon a revolution more bloody than war. M. Chicherin addresses the First Plenary Session of the Genoa Conference (April 1922) with frankness:—

'Whilst themselves reserving the point of view of Communist principles the Russian delegation recognise that in the actual period of history which permits of the parallel existence of the ancient social order and of the new order now being born, economic collaboration between the States representing the two systems of property is imperatively necessary for the general economic reconstruction. . . . The Russian Government is even willing to adopt as its point of departure the old agreements with the Powers which regulate international relations subject to some necessary modifications, and to take part in the revision of the constitution of the League of Nations so as to transform it into a real League of Peoples' (p. 85).

He suggests as a means of stabilising exchanges 'the redistribution of existing gold reserves among all the countries on the same proportion as before the War, by means of long-term loans.' This offer to recognise established Governments and share in their depleted gold reserves left the Genoa Conference rather cold; and M. Chicherin addressed a special note to Mr Lloyd George (April 20, 1922), in which he spoke more plainly still.

'Foreign financial help is absolutely essential for the economic reconstruction of Russia, and as long as there is no prospect of this reconstruction the Russian delegation cannot see its way to put upon their country the burden of debts which could not be discharged. The Russian delegation wishes also to make it clear, although this appears to be self-evident, that the Russian Government could not admit liability for the debts of its predecessors until it has been formally recognised *de jure* by the Powers concerned' (p. 96).

But the Genoa Conference had not for its sole purpose the economic reconstruction of Soviet Russia upon the Soviet's own terms, nor even the transformation of the League of Nations after the Soviet pattern; and the economic landslide in Russia continued.

The years slip on; and in 1929, as in 1922, the chief preoccupation of the Soviet Government is still to raise money for the necessities of daily life. In August 1929 it compels a levy upon the wages of workmen and officials, whereby the sum of, roughly, £36,000,000-£40,000,000 shall be raised, which is better than nothing, though it will not carry a big country very far upon its way. But in June 1929 a Socialist Government had taken office in Great Britain, and, in the words of Mr Ramsay MacDonald as reported in the press, 'By hook or by crook diplomatic relations should be established with Russia.' There followed the romantic secret meetings and discussions which took place in October, at the White Hart Hotel in Lewes, between the British Foreign Secretary and a Soviet envoy.

'Every effort was made to keep the place of the meeting a secret. When Mr Henderson left Brighton by road his destination was unknown to most of his friends. . . . He was "missing" for several hours before his car was seen standing outside the hotel, and it was then discovered that M. Dovgalevsky had arrived and was in conference with Mr Henderson in a private sitting-room. . . . The meeting lasted over two hours. During the whole time detectives guarded the staircases. Servants of the hotel had evidently been sworn to secrecy, too. Every one refused to make any statement.'*

All this secrecy, which is quite in the best 'Bulldog Drummond' tradition, becomes really piquant when viewed in the light of Sir Charles Trevelyan's Preface to a little book on 'The Secret Treaties and Understandings,' by Mr F. Seymour Cocks, in which he says:

'The old system of secret diplomacy is tottering to its fall. President Wilson, who before entering the War had denounced secret diplomacy as the principal cause of the War, has now placed its abolition in the foremost place in his programme. He has pronounced for: "Open covenants of

* 'Evening News,' Oct. 1, 1929.

peace openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view." That announcement has been hailed with approval by the British Labour Party.'

These secret treaties are, of course, those which,

'owing to the action of the Russian Revolutionary Government (became) the common property of the world. . . . In publishing these documents . . . M. Trotski said: "Secret diplomacy is a weapon in the hands of a propertied minority, which is compelled to deceive the majority in order to make the latter obey its interests. . . . The Government of workmen and peasants abolishes secret diplomacy. . . . We have nothing to conceal. . . . We desire a speedy deposition of the supremacy of capital. . . . We turn to the workers with that appeal which will always form the basis of our foreign policy: 'Proletariats of all countries, unite' " (pp. 11, 12).

We return to the documents drafted for public circulation. The Soviet Government convened a conference of neighbouring States to sit at Moscow and to discuss disarmament, and at the first session (Dec. 2, 1922) M. Litvinov made an offer to reduce within a period of eighteen months the 'existing Russian army to one quarter of its present dimensions, i.e. to 200,000 persons,' and desired 'a corresponding diminution of armies of States on the Western frontiers of Russia' (p. 115). At the final session (Dec. 12) the Soviet members expressed acute annoyance at the reluctance of Poland to budget in 1923 for a smaller army than 280,000 men in face of the Russian reduction of 'from 800,000 in 1922 to 600,000 in 1923' (p. 125). The Soviet representatives did not hesitate to accuse the delegations of Poland, Finland, Latvia, and Esthonia of 'merely covering up the absence of any such desire [i.e. for an immediate disarmament which would place their countries unreservedly in the Soviet's power] by statements to the contrary, not even hesitating to manipulate their figures' (p. 124).^{*} After which, it is perhaps hardly surprising that this peace

^{*} 'We know that our statistics and figures are often inaccurate. . . . This, however, does not justify a wholesale disbelief in them' ('Towards Socialism or Capitalism,' Trotski, p. 15). It would seem but ordinary justice to allow the same latitude towards the 'statistics and figures' of other people.

conference ended in general rancour, though in its Note to the League of Nations (March 15, 1923) the Soviet Government explained that 'the responsibility for the failure of the (Moscow) Conference lies in its entirety at the door of the other participants' (p. 127).

'Extract from Resolution of the Fourth U.S.S.R. Congress of Soviets on Government Reports, Moscow, April 19, 1927. 5. The Congress expresses its sympathy with the nationalist emancipatory movement of the Chinese people and approves entirely of the policy of the U.S.S.R. Government in relation to China, based on recognition of the complete sovereignty of China, on principles of equality and complete renunciation by the U.S.S.R. of special privileges enjoyed by foreigners in China. 6. The Congress draws the attention of the people of the whole world to the indisputable fact that the U.S.S.R. is the only State in the world pursuing a direct and active policy of persevering peaceableness, corresponding to the interests of the whole of humanity' (pp. 133, 134).

Unfortunately, this policy of persevering peaceableness appears to have suffered some distortion lately as regards China, for in September 1929 the U.S.S.R. and China are at war. 'Soviet Russia is now making war on China without any declaration,' writes 'The Times' correspondent at Mukden, on Sept. 9. 'The forward movement of the (Soviet) troops is due to the arrival of reinforcements and to the organisation of the forces under Blucher (Galen), the Soviet Commander-in-Chief. . . . The Soviet attack on Pogranichnaia was resumed by 3000 troops at 2 a.m. on Sept. 8, and continued till 7 p.m., the town being subjected to intense artillery fire and bombing by aeroplane.* On Oct. 4, Soviet troops are bombing Chinese villages elsewhere, and so the story continues into December. But M. Barbusse has assured us that 'the peace activities of the Soviet Union are rich in new formulæ and original suggestions for peace'; and the Soviet Government themselves have drawn the attention of the whole world to 'the indisputable fact that theirs is the only State which pursues a direct and active policy of persevering peaceableness.' As 'Punch' would say, 'More headaches for the historian.'

It is difficult to reconcile the readiness of the Soviet

* 'Times,' Sept. 10, 1929.

Government to receive invitations from the League of Nations with their openly expressed contempt for the League and its achievements.

'This peculiar form of pacificism vaunted by the creators and apologists of the world war received its most striking embodiment in the famous Fourteen Points of President Wilson, which were afterwards made the foundation of the Armistice between the Allies and Germany. . . . A special international organ, known to us as the League of Nations, was on the proposal of Wilson set up for the carrying out of that pacificism which went hand in hand with the carrying out of the world war and the conclusion of the Versailles Treaty and other Peace Treaties' (pp. 208, 209).

The League's 'vacillations and delays' (p. 209), and the official language used in its deliberations (p. 203) are also satirised; and at the Ninth Sitting of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission (March 25, 1928), M. Litvinov, the head of the Soviet Delegation, complained that

'projects introduced as far as I can remember by individual delegations, I think by the British and by the French delegations, were given a first reading immediately. The President did not propose to brush these proposals aside and keep them somewhere in the drawers of the Secretariat of the League to mature. They were considered immediately. Why cannot the same procedure be applied in the case of proposals of the Soviet delegation?' (p. 203).

At this Preparatory Disarmament Commission (November 1927) the Soviet delegation, through M. Litvinov, made proposals for 'general, complete, and immediate disarmament,' of so fantastic and immature a character that they were foredoomed to failure even before experts could examine them. No. 5 of the Soviet 'Memorandum explaining the Draft Convention' (for a special Memorandum was necessary to explain the proposals made) laid down that

'Police forces of every kind must be armed with modern weapons of the simplest pattern, because if a more complicated armament were retained it might be easier for these formations to be used as armed forces in attacks by stronger upon weaker countries. Article 15 provides that sporting-guns of non-military pattern and revolvers for sporting purposes and for self-defence may be retained. In view of the general

social situation these measures are particularly necessary in countries where communications are undeveloped' (pp. 164-166).

By an interesting coincidence, just about the time that the Soviet delegation presented these proposals for world disarmament, 'The Times' published an article by a military correspondent on the Soviet Army, from which we make bold to detach a few salient facts which serve the argument. 'In 1914,' says this correspondent,

'the peace establishment of the Imperial Russian Army amounted to 1,300,000 all ranks. . . . To-day, the Red Army, including the air arm, has a peace strength of 1,124,000. . . . It is estimated that in time of war the Soviet Government would have at its disposal about 10,000,000 between the ages of 18 and 31. . . . As in Imperial days, the Army is recruited by conscription . . . preliminary military training begins at the age of 16, and all youths between the ages of 16 and 19 receive annually 160 hours of drill and physical exercise.'

In the autumn of 1927 this was raised to 180 hours of theoretical training for students in the higher educational establishments, including women students, 'and two months' practical training in camp. . . . The Army is organised into 21 corps and 3 cavalry corps. As a rule each corps has 3 divisions and the usual corps troops, to which is added a gas regiment. . . . The great number of automatic weapons in use in the Red Army should be noted.' The transport allowance of 3000 vehicles and 9000 animals to a division

'is greatly in excess of that in any other army of the first grade. Measures are being taken to provide adequate mechanical transport. . . . In addition to the normal troops of the Red Army there are those controlled by the OGPU. They are a political weapon, devised for the suppression of revolution, the detection of espionage, the guarding of the frontier and many other functions for the protection of the Government in being. Because of these duties they are treated with special benevolence, and are trained and equipped with care. . . . Gas warfare is regarded as important, and endeavours are being made to devise new gases and to extend the means of production. . . . There is a central gas school at which courses of training of one or two years are given.' *

* 'Times,' Nov. 23, 1927.

The Preparatory Disarmament Convention did not immediately adopt the Soviet proposals; and M. Litvinov, replying to comments and criticisms by the other delegations (March 22, 1928), launched an attack upon the British representative, Lord Cushendun.

'The honourable representative for Great Britain saw fit to use the question of disarmament publicly to accuse the Soviet Government once more (as his own Government has already done times without number) of so-called propaganda. Lord Cushendun does not realise the unreasonableness of persisting in the use of a weapon long rendered innocuous by the exposure in so many countries of scores of officers and bureaux, largely staffed by Russian emigrés, for the specific purpose of drawing up forged documents for foreign governments, proving alleged propaganda by the Soviet Government in foreign countries. . . . The British Government is inclined to consider a speech uttered or an article published in Moscow regarding the policy or internal affairs of another country as interference, while not admitting as interference the arbitrary stationing of naval squadrons in foreign ports (Shanghai) . . . the demand that the Government of an independent country should cease operations against an insurgent subject (Sir Percy Lawrence, ultimatum to the Persian Government, Nov. 24), and the demand for his reinstatement (note to the Persian Government, November 1927), and the limitation of the army of this country (note to the Persian Government, 1929), etc. . . . But, gentlemen, you will ask me what has this ancient Soviet-British dispute to do with disarmament? I am forced to reply that it has nothing to do with it. It was not I who brought it up, but the representative of Great Britain, and I should consider it a mark of discourtesy and disrespect to him to ignore any of his questions' (p. 190). And 'Lord Cushendun would have saved himself much time and labour and considerably shortened his speech if he had not built up all his arguments on false premises' (p. 190).

M. Litvinov, whose own speech with its 'annexe' occupies thirty pages of close print in this book (pp. 168-198), further stated that

'the peaceful policy of the Soviet Government is not to be changed by any such attacks. So long as other Governments keep up such an irreconcilable position with regard to disarmament, we shall, of course, not weaken the defensive

powers of our State, but will keep a watchful eye on all the movements of our innumerable foes. . . . The Soviet Delegation intends to go on fulfilling its task, thoroughly realising the utter lack of seriousness and the uselessness of the work to be done by the Commission in its sessions and sittings, so long as the concrete proposals made by the Soviet Delegation are ignored' (pp. 231, 235).

In other words, the Soviet Government will neither discuss the disarmament proposals of any other country, nor admit criticism of their own.

Eight years ago Mr Ramsay MacDonald wrote, 'We can now take the Moscow Soviet Communist Revolutionary Government under our wing, and clothe it in the furs of apology to shield it from the blasts of criticism.' * These Soviet documents induce in us the conviction that apology is futile where words and deeds have no relation to each other. Englishmen who believe that England has done more for peace than talk about it, who know that her will for peace now is so strong that she has reduced her offensive and defensive weapons more than any other country in the world, not excepting Soviet Russia, should study these Soviet peace documents. They will find them, as M. Barbusse so truly says, 'worthy of attentive study as well as closer acquaintance.'

GEOFFREY POPHAM.

* 'Forward,' Oct. 14, 1922.

Art. 9.—A PAINTER OF FERRARA.

THE edition of the 'Orlando Furioso,' published in 1532, the year preceding that of the poet's death, newly corrected as the title states by the author and increased by the addition of various stanzas and six new cantos, has, among the former, two in which Ariosto enumerates, first, certain outstanding names among the painters of antiquity, and then of those of his own age. A cursory glance at the pages of Lemprière confirms the inference as to the discretion of the first list, which follows from the fact that Ariosto was versed in classical lore. The second stanza :

'E quei che furo a' nostri di, o sono ora,
Leonardo, Andrea Mantegna, Gian Bellino,
Duo Dossi, e quel ch'a par sculpe e colora,
Michel, più che mortale, Angel divino ;
Bastiano, Rafael, Tizian ch'onora
Non men Cadore, che quei Venezia e Urbino ;
E gli altri di cui tal l'opra si vede,
Qual della prisca età si legge e crede :'

(And those who were in our days or now are, Leonardo, Andrea Mantegna, Gian Bellino, two Dossi, and he who is equal as sculptor and painter, Michael, Angel divine rather than mortal man ; Sebastiano, Raphael, Titian, who honours Cadore not less than they do Venice and Urbino ; and the others of whom such work is seen as is read and believed of the former age.)

has, however, the greater interest, for here the poet, by assuming the rôle of art critic, is passing judgment upon his contemporaries. Such judgments are rare : they tend, however, to be stable. Dante's lines about Cimabue and Giotto furnish the classic instance :

'Credette Cimabue nella pittura
Tener lo campo, ed ora ha Giotto il grido,
Si che la fama di colui è oscura.'

In the domain of literary criticism also Dante, in his 'Vulgari Eloquio,' and Petrarch in the 'Trionfi,' in their estimates of various masters of Provençal song, have set up landmarks the stability of which no tide of criticism has ever placed in doubt. This is not so, however, with Ariosto's stanza. Contemporary criticism at once impugned it as regards three of the nine names.

Lodovico Dolce, who was an intimate associate of Titian, in his '*Dialogo della Pittura*,' published in 1557, represents Ariosto as saying that Ariosto has shown very acute judgment in all parts of his poem except in this.

'I do not refer,' he says, 'to his praise of Michel Angelo, who is worthy of all praise, but to his placing among the number of those famous painters whom he names the two Dossi of Ferrara, one of whom was here at Venice for some time in order to learn painting from Titian, and the other was in Rome with Raphael; but the manner they acquired was so clumsy that they are unworthy of the pen of so great a poet.'

'This mistake might be condoned on the ground that he was led into error by love of country if he had not committed an even greater error in classing Sebastiano with Raphael and Titian, since there are many much better painters who yet are not worthy to be compared with either.'

Such a peccadillo, however, he adds, does not detract in any way from Ariosto's pre-eminence as a poet, for such judgments do not properly belong to the poet's office.

He concludes, on a more urbane note, that he does not wish to infer that Sebastiano is not quite a good painter, but merely that he is not in the same rank as the others, adding that, as every one knows, Michel Angelo supplied him with his drawings, and so he is the crow described by Horace as dressed up in another's feathers.

Fabrini, the other character in the dialogue, replies with an incident told him by Titian of how some German soldiers who were quartered in the Vatican after the sack of Rome carelessly lit a fire in one of the rooms painted by Raphael, and damage was caused either by the smoke or by their hands to some of the heads in the fresco, and how Clement VIII, after his return to Rome, commissioned Sebastiano to repair the damage. How Titian, who happened afterwards to be in Rome, visited these rooms in company with Sebastiano, and seeing the parts which had been restored, and not knowing who had done the work, inquired of him what presumptuous and ignorant painter had so disfigured the faces.

Ariosto's claim as regards Sebastiano del Piombo would find absolutely no supporters now; but Ariosto had visited Rome in 1512 and again in 1513, in the service of the Duke Alfonso, and Sebastiano had just gone there

from Venice, fresh from that association with Giorgione which had caused his manner of painting to be so attractive to Agostino Chigi that he invited him to Rome to decorate his palace in the Trastevere, in the arches of which, according to Vasari, 'he made many fanciful subjects in the manner which he had brought with him from Venice.' There his 'Polyphemus' was made in attempted rivalry with Raphael's 'Galatea,' and this and the other 'fanciful subjects' would naturally commend him to such a master of romance as Ariosto. His 'Raising of Lazarus' was, as Ariosto must have heard, exhibited side by side with Raphael's 'Transfiguration,' and in proportion as the precepts and drawings of Michel Angelo in place of Giorgione became the dominant influence in his work, it would acquire a new title to inclusion in a list in which the work of Michel Angelo was awarded a certain pre-eminence. So much may be allowed for Ariosto's claim as regards the chameleon of painters Sebastiano del Piombo.

As regards six of the other names in the stanza, Leonardo, Michel Angelo, Raphael, Titian, Mantegna, and Giovanni Bellini, we may express our thought tersely in the line of Arnold :

'Others abide our question, thou art free !'

when we consider what the work of each stands for in the development of Italian art. There yet remain the two Dossi. As regards the younger—Battista Dossi—his inclusion in any such list is so inexplicable that I feel driven to suppose that, as the brothers were frequently associated together in commissions, the poet thought fit to look upon their work as a single art factor. Vasari neglects him altogether in his terse remark, *à propos* of this stanza, that the name of Dosso has obtained greater fame from the pen of Messer Lodovico than from all the pencils and colours used by himself in the whole course of his life. Vasari's account of Dosso Dossi, which Morelli characterises as cursory, biassed and unjust, is, as his narrative shows, due in some part to prejudice implanted in his mind by Girolamo Genga, who had been the Dossis' rival in a commission to decorate the Palazzo Imperiale near Pesaro for the Duke of Urbino.

Conscious, perhaps, of the unusual asperity of his reference, he attempted to lessen it in the succeeding

paragraph by the remark that in a very beautiful picture which they painted at Faenza the brothers greatly surpassed their previous labours by the adoption of a new manner. And in the later edition of his work he made the *amende honorable* in his life of Girolamo da Carpi by saying of a Bacchanal painted by Dosso Dossi in the Duke's room in the palace of Ferrara, where Bellini and Titian also worked, that the figures in it were so fine that he would well merit the name of an excellent painter for that work alone if he had never produced any other.

Milanesi suggests that this passage owes its origin to Vasari's tour of Italy in 1566, when he had the opportunity of forming a juster appreciation of Dosso Dossi's work. In his life of Titian he speaks of Dosso as having in 1514 decorated certain compartments in one of the small rooms of the Duke's palace with histories of Æneas, Mars and Venus, and Vulcan in a grotto with two smiths working at a forge. The Bacchanal already referred to was placed in a larger room alongside works by Giovanni Bellini and Titian. A work by Raphael would have hung beside them if the painter had ever found time to fulfil the promise which he made to the Duke. When, however, three years had elapsed, which resulted in nothing but a drawing being sent, the Duke's anger found vent in furious despatches, and it was to Battista Dossi, then in Rome, that the painter appealed to placate the Duke through his brother Dosso, by the promise that the picture should be taken in hand so soon as he had finished the 'Transfiguration.' The painter's death, however, intervened.

The citation of contemporary opinion with its play of light and some malevolence of shadow ends more urbanely with the tribute of Paolo Giovio, bishop of Nocera, but more famous as historian and biographer. His 'dialogues concerning famous men of letters,' which bears the date 1527, written in his retirement at Como, contained brief biographies of Leonardo, Michel Angelo, and Raphael, and with the last are notes upon five other painters, of whom Dosso Dossi is one. The fact that the author was never in contact with the court of Ferrara makes his reference the more eloquent witness to the extent of the painter's fame among his contemporaries.

'The cultured mind of Dosso of Ferrara shows even more in his minor works than in his regular set pieces. To him

the pursuit of the picturesque byways of painting was less a labour than a passion : precipices, green forests, shady river-banks, the paraphernalia of prosperous husbandry, the contentment and the bustle of the farm, far-stretching vistas over land and sea, shipping, fowling, hunting, all that class of sights which are a delight to the eye—all these provided unfailing material for his exuberant and joyous hand.'

Here, as in his life of Leonardo, Paolo Giovio conveys in a few sentences a vivid impression of personality. We see, if not fully the romanticism, at least the essential humanism of the artist, and his preoccupation in the joyousness of nature and man's activity :

' Your chilly stars I can forego
This warm kind earth is all I know.'

The couplet may serve to sum up the essential difference between the outlook of the first and the last great Ferrarese master, Cosimo Tura—the rugged—with whom every line is virile and functional, but endowed with such super-abundant energy as seems to chafe within the narrow limits of the cloister in which art had perforce to walk, and Dosso Dossi—whose characters are of the warm kind earth—in whose altar pieces even the warrior saints seem as it were fortuitous, actors who in a sense have missed their destiny, because severed from the highways of romance, in which they live and move and have their being. Yet, in respect of their physical structure, his figures are no mere shadowy creations of a world of fantasy, but firmly, ripely, built as those of Renoir. The glorious, dominating 'Circe' of the Borghese, the grave 'St William' at Hampton Court, the laughing-eyed 'Jester' at Modena are the works of one who sees life in all the bloom of its beauty, and in the fullness and variety of its strength. Of Dosso it may be said, as Meier Graefe says of Renoir, that he has the power to render vitality with all the resources of the painter. And how he achieved this power in remote Ferrara in the 'Cinquecento' is surely the greater mystery !

Of his upbringing very little is known, and in the absence of such knowledge the consideration of his artistic environment gains an additional importance. From the time of Leonello, the thirteenth Marquis, it had been the settled policy of the house of Este to welcome foreign masters

to their court. Records show the presence and activity at Ferrara during different periods of Pisanello, Jacopo Bellini, Mantegna, and Piero de' Franceschi, the last having painted frescoes in certain rooms in the palace and in a chapel.

These works have all perished ; but while they existed they were the school of native masters, and this serves in part to explain why, when the era of Ferrarese art production began, the level of technical achievement was so astonishingly high. Vasari gives the name of Cosimo Tura's master as Galasso, but he is nothing more than a name. It is possible that some fragments of the substance of Squarcione's teaching may have somehow reached Ferrara. The fact, nevertheless, remains that Tura, in his rugged strength and sincerity, is one of the most outstanding examples of originality in Italian art. After him came Cossa, Ercole Roberti, and Lorenzo Costa. This last, under whom Dosso Dossi is believed to have studied for a time, worked at Bologna for the Bentivogli, and afterwards entered the service of the Gonzagas as court painter.

Giovanni or Dosso Dossi was the elder of the two sons of Nicolo di Lutero, steward of Duke Ercole I, the origin of the name he usually bears being ascribed to the fact of the family having come originally from Dosso in the Trentino or to their having possessed property of that name in Pieve di Cento, where, according to Baruffaldi, (' *Vite de' pittori e scultori Ferraresi* ') the artist was born, which event took place probably in the year 1479.

Tradition has it that both the brothers were for a time apprenticed to Lorenzo Costa during the period of his residence in Bologna in the service of the Bentivogli. Baruffaldi is the authority for the statement that as they found that Costa was too much occupied with his other pupils to give them individual attention, they got the Duke's permission to travel, and spent six years at Rome and five at Venice. As, however, the art of Dosso Dossi does not show any trace of Roman influences, it seems more probable that the brothers separated—that Battista went to Rome and Dosso to Venice. Lodovico Dolce, whose evidence is virtually that of a contemporary, says 'one of them stayed here at Venice for some time to learn to paint with Titian, and the other in Rome with Raphael.'

Perhaps, however, the reference is to Battista Dossi's residence in Rome at a later period, he having, as records show, worked there under Raphael in the year 1520.

The exact period of Dosso Dossi's residence in Venice is a matter of conjecture; it must, however, have ended by 1510, since, as Professor Gardner says, 'when the League of Cambrai bore fruit in war and Duke Alfonso took the field against the armies of the republic, Venice became an intolerable place of residence for a subject of the House of Este.' He seems to have worked for a time in Mantua, where records show a payment to him, in April 1512, for a large picture consisting of eleven figures.

On the death of Julius II in the following February, Ferrara's war for existence was temporarily ended. In the following year apparently Dosso Dossi returned there, and from this date onwards, as a long succession of fairly continuous records show, until his death, which occurred in 1541, he was employed as chief court painter in the service first of Alfonso and then of his successor Ercole II. The duties of his office permitted him to undertake journeys on the Duke's affairs in the years 1517 and 1518 to Florence and Venice, and in the following year, as a letter from one of Isabella d'Este's correspondents shows, he travelled with Titian to Mantua for the purpose of seeing the works of art there. His brother Battista's name is associated with his in a record of 1517, and again frequently after Battista's return from Rome in 1524.

Tradition tells of friction between them, the younger resenting his subordinate position. The records refer to a drawing of Ferrara which he made in 1523 at the request of Isabella d'Este, and to the urgency of the latter that he should use it for a picture, and in the following year he made portraits of the two daughters of the ex-Queen of Naples, who was then living in Ferrara under the Duke's protection. A year later, according to Baruffaldi, he accompanied the Duke to Spain for the purpose of painting a portrait of Charles the Fifth. Works in fresco were done by the two brothers in decoration of the archiepiscopal palace at Trent, of the Villa Imperiale at Pesaro for the Duke of Urbino, and of the Duke's villa of Belriguardo. Nothing is known of the portraits, and of the frescoes only fragments exist.

Together with those of his work as a painter there are

records of much activity in connection with the usual festivities of the court, the designing of triumphal cars, banners, and the like, the painting of the scenery for the representation of comedies—those of Ariosto and others—the decoration of walls and ceilings in various rooms of the ducal palaces, of bedsteads, and reading-desks, designs for use on coins, majolica and tapestries, and ornaments for the cannon the casting of which in his private workshop was one of the duke's chief pleasures. Within his narrower limits he had in court service something of the versatility of Leonardo. With these, however, each and all, time has dealt havoc. It is only from certain of his pictures that it is now possible to attempt to estimate the measure of his gifts. And here, too, fate has been capricious. With the few exceptions referred to, his work was all for places within the confines of the duchy. He left many works at Ferrara, Rovigo, and Modena.

When the Papacy acquired possession of Ferrara, at the close of the sixteenth century, those at Ferrara were for the most part taken to Rome, and of those which were removed to Modena, where the House of Este still had its seat, a great part were numbered among the section of the Modena gallery bought by Augustus III in 1745, and these are now among the chief glories of the Dresden Gallery.

Dosso Dossi has been termed the Ariosto of painting. 'The praise is not excessive,' remarks Ventori, 'if one thinks of his cavalier saints clad in their armour of glittering steel, his figures with draperies of flowered brocade on gold ground, his angels with hair streaming in the wind, his landscapes flooded with light.' Rarely surely, if ever, have two men been associated together in service in the same court who in the practice of different arts have revealed such an innate kinship of interests and sympathies. Some of the stanzas in the great romantic epic might serve almost without change of line as a description of certain of Dossi's pictures, and some of these would equally serve to personify and visualise characters and incidents in the poem, the spirit of romance being the common factor in both. So it is in those works where unfettered by precedent he has a clear avenue of approach to his ideal—works to which the term romantic genre may perhaps be applied—rather than in his altar-pieces that his genius makes its most impressive appeal.

Of the influences which went to the building of his art after its initial period of growth in the Ferrara of the Quattrocento, the years spent at Venice and the opportunity which these afforded of learning from the art of Giorgione were undoubtedly among the most potent. As a colourist pure and simple he learnt something from all contact with the comparatively sensuous art of Venice—and, indeed, from Titian himself as much as from any; but in the perception of the effect of light on colour, in which his work serves in part as a link between Giorgione and Correggio—to whom he may have passed on his knowledge when the two were together in Mantua—in the arrangement as seen apparently effortless and unstudied in the figures of his genre pieces, in the sympathy with the variability of Nature's moods which marks his treatment of landscape, and the meditative quality which the subtle diffusion of light produces in his portraits—in all these Giorgione is his closest exemplar among the Venetians.

The influence is seen at its height in his 'Nymph pursued by a Faun' in the Pitti, painted very soon after he left Venice, during the period when the golden haze of Giorgione's colouring was the inevitable ideal to be aimed at in such an idyl as this. We may note how entirely the static harmonies that result from the incidence of the light dispel the impulse of action. He had won from Venice more of her colour sense than was possessed by any other painter trained in another school; but by degrees the influence lessened, and the process may have been quickened by his sojourn in Mantua and the renewal of intercourse with Lorenzo Costa and also that with Correggio. Being a Ferrarese and not a Venetian, and as such being through Lorenzo Costa of the lineage of Cosimo Tura, he is at heart more of a draughtsman, and he gradually resumed the sense of linear values which for a time the colour harmonies of the Venetians had tended to obscure.

The two Circe pictures represent stages in this process; in the second the recovery is complete. It is Ferrarese. It must have seemed the work of a strong man abiding in his own house when it hung—as a great pictured arras might hang—on the wall of one of the rooms of the castle of Ferrara, where also hung Bellini's Bacchanal and Titian's 'Bacchus and Ariadne.'

Both the pictures were among the treasures of the

recent Italian Exhibition. In the earlier of the two, now belonging to Sir Joseph Duveen, the enchantress is seated on a bank, nude, except for a dark green cloth thrown across the left leg. She wears a garland of flowers and holds up an inscribed stone tablet with her left arm and rests her right hand on it. An open book at her feet contains hieroglyphics. In the grove of trees behind her the antlers, head, and shoulders of a stag are visible, in front of which is a deerhound and a pug lying down. A wood pigeon is perched above, and on a branch to the left sits a barn owl. A wooded vista opens to the left with a farm in the distance. At Circe's side a hind is standing, and a panther is disappearing round the bank.

In the foreground on the left a crane is drinking at a pool, behind which a large dog is sitting, whose face has a troubled and somewhat human expression. Considering it as a composition, the number of the animals is somewhat distracting, but the lissom, faultless figure of the enchantress must rank as Dossi's finest rendering of the nude. The colour is curiously flat and hesitating by contrast with the glow of the later version which is in the Borghese Gallery.

In this the landscape is very rich and varied, and the bright light of the sun makes strong contrasts. The enchantress, a stately figure in gilded turban, wearing a robe of ruby-coloured damask fringed with gold, sits within a circle traced on the ground inscribed with cabalistic signs. In her right hand she holds a writing-board with geometrical symbols, in her left a torch, which takes fire from a cup on the ground in which pitch is burning. To the left is a cuirass, on which a pigeon perches; a large mastiff with bloodshot eyes sits behind it, and a duck is on the ground near. Beyond are the trunks of two trees wreathed with ivy, with pygmy human figures tied to them; these, according to Ventori, are abortions, and on them the eyes of the enchantress seem to be fixed.

In the middle distance two young men are sitting on the ground and another stands with them.

In the background a river winds up to a walled city with battlements and towers, and beyond it is a line of blue hills. The presence of the knight's cuirass adds a note of realism to the paraphernalia of transformation which is lacking in the earlier version.

The impressiveness of the action of the foreground is further enhanced by the contrast offered by the unconscious group in the middle distance and the beauty of the wooded hill-country beyond.

The simplicity and directness of his power are no less strikingly displayed in the portrait of a Jester in the Modena Gallery, which was also lent to Burlington House. The head and shoulders are seen against a tree trunk, with a landscape vista beyond. A young man, clean shaven, with auburn hair, dull red tunic, dark brown cap, from which a coin is seen hanging somewhat like an ear-ring, has his left arm round a sheep. The eyes seem to dance with merriment, the lips are parted with a smile that transforms the whole face, making every nerve and muscle quiver with expression. The painter has in this extremely simple composition achieved one of the most difficult tasks which the artist can set before himself, that of interpreting the momentary so that the action lives arrested. The happy, inconsequent smile is an absolute triumph of realism. It seems both to represent and to communicate happiness. In his book on the Ferrarese Painters, Professor Gardner pays tribute alike to the merit of this picture and to the artist's power in portraiture by saying that to some extent it holds the same position in Dosso Dossi's art as the 'Mona Lisa' does in Leonardo's. We may add, however, that no critic has ever characterised this smile as 'fascinating and intolerable.' It is comparatively early work. The landscape shows some trace of Venetian influence in its low, rich tones, and in the treatment of the blue distance of its sea-like plain. But here the influence ends. A feeling for romance was as native to Dosso Dossi as was that of Giorgione for idyllic reverie.

Realism is also the dominant note in what was for long the only example of Dossi's art in the National Gallery. 'A Muse inspiring a Court Poet' represents the head and shoulders of a sleek, rather stout, whiskered, middle-aged man, towards whom the figure of a muse seen in half-length is bending, her hair wreathed with branches and flowers of jasmine, her lips parted, her expression very animated.

We feel as we look at her that if it be at all possible she will inspire the figure beside her, but that she has set

herself a hard task. It is certain that it is not one of Dossi's more important works ; but there can be no doubt about its genuineness, and it has an added personal interest in that it reveals something of the humour which must have stood him in good stead in the vicissitudes of court service. It is to me inexplicable why on the occasion of certain rearrangements in the Gallery it should have been relegated to the basement, where it remains.

In the ' Adoration of the Kings ' in the Mond Collection, however, the National Gallery exhibits one of the artist's most characteristic works. It is entirely romantic both in actors and scene. The kings are paladins. The picture is of low tonality, but as we look intently in the parts deepest in shadow we feel that, previous to Rembrandt, only Correggio had the power to make the shadows hold and reveal so much as they do here. The vegetation has perhaps some kinship with Giorgione's ' Tempest.' Each seems to stress the humidity of nature. But the deep rich glow of suffused light, and the wine-red belt of sky, against which the feathery branches of aspens are set in Corot-like delicacy of texture, have an impressiveness that is altogether peculiar to Dossi. The impression left upon the observer by this landscape background, as of that in another picture somewhat akin to this—the ' Holy Family with St Elizabeth,' at Hampton Court—may recall a perfect vignette of description in Sordello :

' Ferrara's eve was stilled ;
The last remains of sunset dimly burned,
The woods beneath lay black.'

Browning was either visualising an actual impression of travel formed during one of his youthful wanderings or was giving his imagination rein. He has, however, in his lines represented unforgettably the moment of such atmospheric conditions as Dosso Dossi, who had seen ' Ferrara's eve ' a thousand times, has shown in these two pictures.

This ' Holy Family with St Elizabeth ' is almost a night piece, with the light emanating from the head and shining halo of the Madonna. She is, as always with the painter, a virile, country type. In conformity with the canon followed by Raphael, her head forms the apex of a triangle of which her foot and the foot of the Child form

the angles. The head of the Child, deep in shadow as it lies, but delineated with the utmost distinctness, suggests the influence his art exerted over that of Correggio. The light of the moon is almost entirely obscured by a dark cloud, on which rest four cherubs. The deep, dark blue of their forms made me imagine for a moment when I saw them that they had served to stimulate Mr Anning Bell's colour-sense when painting the tiny water sprites in his picture entitled 'The Sea Maid's Music.' The presence at Hampton Court, in addition to this Holy Family, of the half-length figure of St William in armour, 'the happy warrior,' his face furrowed with the strain of combat, of such a typical specimen of his portraits as that of a man full-face wearing a black hat with four rings on his fingers, and of the group of a man in armour and a woman holding a flute styled in the catalogue, 'A soldier with his wench,' reminiscent somewhat of the group of eight persons in the Pitti known as *Bambocciata*, causes this Gallery to be unusually rich in examples of the work of this master, more so probably than any other outside Italy with the exception of that of Dresden.

I have endeavoured to illustrate Dosso Dossi's outstanding qualities as a painter from the consideration mainly of examples of his art which either are or recently have been in England. Of the many excellent examples in the various galleries of Rome, other than the *Circe*, I have said nothing. But what an opportunity there presents itself for study of his works in their variety: the *Apollo and Daphne*, the *David with the head of Goliath*, the *Virgin and Child*, and the *Nativity*, all in the *Borghese*, the *Holy Family* in the *Capitoline*,—perhaps the best of all his *Holy Families*—the *Dido with the helmet of Æneas* in the *Doria*, the portrait of a warrior in the *Colonna*! Nor have I made any mention of such romantically conceived and executed figures as the paladin-like *St John* in the *Pitti*, or the *St Sebastian* in the *Brera*, nor of any of the great works at Dresden. But enough has been said, I hope, to show that as regards the one of the two Dossi, Ariosto had some warrant for his reference.

EDWARD MCCURDY.

Art. 10.—'MALBROOK.'

1. *England under Queen Anne: Blenheim.* By George Macaulay Trevelyan, O.M. With Maps. Longmans, 1930.
2. *Marlborough. The Portrait of a Conqueror.* By Donald Barr Chidsey. Murray, 1930.

ALTHOUGH a considerable library has been written about the achievements, qualities, and defects of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, the full story of his life with a complete study of his personality has not yet been told and almost certainly never will or never can be told; because so many extreme diversities and complexities of character were contained within that handsome body. Possibly not even Marlborough himself was aware of half the implications of many of his decisions, and it would be still more so with his innumerable subtle and hidden purposes. He did not wear his heart upon his sleeve; still less were the workings of his mind publicly displayed. Had he been as carelessly open as that figure of speech suggests, he could not have become the very great soldier or careful politician that he was in most difficult times, or have retained the reputation for unfaithfulness in certain crises of history and of his own career which enwraps his gracious figure like an unfit, ungainly cloak. Yet for ever the man fascinates, as is bound to be with one whose person expressed such an extraordinary charm with the blackest uncertainties of doubt. Was he a traitor? To what degree was he a traitor? Remembering the many and extreme difficulties of the years in which his life was spent, was it possible for any man in politics then, or for any one of his contemporaries who was touched with ambitions in soldiership or in statesmanship, not to ride some crooked courses? That being so, was Marlborough's moral perversity, when his difficulties and opportunities are remembered, really worse than that of almost any other of the lesser men who crowded the courts of Charles the Second, James the Second, William and Mary, and Anne? They lived in an uncertain and most uneasy period.

It is impossible for any historian to be strictly impartial, even when he is dull. Dealing with human

events and persons, a natural bias—the historian himself being human—is bound to intervene ; and every aspect of truth honestly captured and expressed is apt to wear such colouring as is sympathetic to the mind of the writer. Religious determinations, political prejudices, racial affections or dislikes, in some measure are bound to enter in ; otherwise the subject himself would hardly fail to be less than human. With such as Marlborough, who was at once prominent, even predominant, and yet often most obscure, the spirits of an ardent championship and of an equally earnest antagonism are bound to rage. So much of him is based on mere assumptions ; and so much that is known of him is liable to be doubted or misread, and therefore tends to misrepresentation. To some writers of history, as Lord Macaulay, William Makepeace Thackeray, and Dean Swift, he was a 'villain of genius' and a splendid opportunity for brilliant denunciation, often magnificently unjust. To others, like Archdeacon Coxe, whose ordering and transcripts of the Blenheim papers have earned the grateful thanks of serious students, he was barely this side even of deity itself. The truth, of course, rests somewhere—probably near midway, as with most of us—between those extremes ; but the tendency of further researches has been to make Marlborough decidedly a more likeable man and unquestionably a far greater general than formerly had been thought.

As to his position amongst the leaders of military genius in the world's history, not one—not Alexander or Napoleon or any other—can be put unhesitatingly above him ; and every fresh study of his campaigns, always remembering the extraordinary difficulties he was beset with, strengthens further his outstanding position. It is always desirable, even necessary, before giving judgment on the actions or motives of Marlborough, to try and put oneself in his place. Nobody of such high—the highest—military responsibility was ever more hampered, harassed, or, as he himself put it, 'tagged' than he. Beside the ordinary ignorant obstructions and frank opposition of politicians, hindering or spoiling his purposes, he was cursed in his military policy when on the continent by the over-cautious Dutch Deputies and the weak, or lethargic, or unimaginative, or jealous colleagues, English

and Dutch, with whom he was compelled to take counsel ; until the day of his great decision when he cut the knot of the ordained restrictions and made his brilliant march to the Danube, and to the victory of Blenheim.

Two volumes have recently been published which bring again into prominence the greatness of achievement, influence, and charm, as well as the faults and weaknesses of Marlborough. They are as different in character as works dealing with the same subject well can be. Mr G. M. Trevelyan makes a close study of the times of Queen Anne out of which Marlborough emerges as the supreme actor on that crowded stage. Hence the sub-title, which is in a way the chief title of his book, 'Blenheim.' Mr Donald Barr Chidsey, on the other hand, makes a rapid personal sketch of his superman ; and, writing with an American freshness and smartness, yet with a pretty close fidelity to historical truth, gives a breathing if highly-coloured reality to his subject. His methods are modern, but he belongs less to the new historical school of Mr Lytton Strachey than to that, rather less recent, of Mr C. R. L. Fletcher, with, of course, such differences of attack and phrasing as result from a trans-Atlantic vocabulary and origins. He loves to paint a character with an epithet, which need not necessarily be over-scrupulously true. Titus Oates he has seen as 'a bandy-legged little beast' ; Queen Anne was 'roly-poly' ; James the Second was 'a pig-headed fool.' Marlborough, we are told, was troubled by 'pop-eyed fanatics.' King William saw him as 'a feline dandy' after the tarnish and angers of warfare were removed from him. With many a racy colloquialism of the kind the narrative rushes along, and is not merely vigorous and entertaining, but is also enjoyable and convincing. Obviously it expresses a highly individual point of view, but notwithstanding his freshness of style Mr Chidsey has taken no serious liberties with the facts and confessedly acknowledges that all that he says is based on the writings of others. He has justification, possibly even for the 'pop-eyed.' His lightning biography, as well as Mr Trevelyan's more sober and scholarly work, is helpful. It has, at any rate, the brightness and the qualities of clear and picturesque expression which should make it acceptable to those readers who rarely can tear themselves from their favourite

fiction. At the same time, its American origin has caused occasional slips, as where Mr Chidsey describes Catharine of Braganza as the 'Dowager-Queen' in the reign of James the Second. History would, indeed, have been different had the wife of Charles the Second been eventually a Dowager Queen, and she, too—poor lady!—would have been a happier woman.

Mr Trevelyan's work is the more important volume, because of its thoughtful care, its fullness, range, and comprehensiveness, and its authority. Although he has nothing of his famous great-uncle's vivid and epigrammatic brilliancy, he writes well and with feeling, and has a capacity for seeing both sides of a movement fairly; while, for political sinners and saints alike, he shows a generous spirit of tolerance; these last being qualities which Lord Macaulay did not much possess and for the lack of which his *History and Historical Essays* were, probably, the more entertaining. Tolerance is outstanding in this book. The Age of Anne was full of bitterness and hatred, rancour, jealousies, brutality, cruelty; it was a time (but not the only time) when little men could sometimes successfully incite to great passions and cause enormous destruction; and when the great men often proved mean and little. Yet Mr Trevelyan never fails to see some excuse or justification for the faults of his actors and their stage and time. Those vindictive sectaries were merely and naturally re-acting after a similar persecution; those rogues and vagabonds after all were soldiers dismissed through no fault of their own; while, as to that bigot, that bully, that hypocrite, that tyrant, or that traitor—in his very iniquity might not he also have been animated with a noble purpose or desperate unselfish hope to which we have missed or have not been given the clue? Mr Trevelyan manages to give every devil his due, and thereby shows a right quality of sympathy, more likely to be just and historically true than is the flashing wit that can damn or indemnify with an epigram or even with a single adjective. He is a very comforting advocate for John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough.

The great man is, however, merely one actor in Mr Trevelyan's representation of the sombre tragedy of the reign of Queen Anne; while Sarah, his

masterful Duchess, with whom Mr Chidsey makes abundant and amusing play, appears less prominently here, although, of course, her influence on 'Mrs Morley' and on her husband is brought out clearly enough. The especial value of the book rests in its compact and well-ordered survey of the times in which the Marlboroughs and their friends and enemies moved and wrought. It was a greater, and even a busier, age than is commonly supposed; an age in which much of the best in our later history found its earliest inspiration. Mr Trevelyan, in his Preface, puts the point well:

'If, indeed, the story of the great events and the great men of our Augustan age could be told in its truth and simplicity, as only the man of Athens could have told it, it would be more like a five-act tragedy from start to finish, presenting in turn the overwhelming pride and the fall of Louis, then of Marlborough and of the Whigs, then of the Tories in their turn, while, through the crash of each successive crisis of war and politics, the fortune of England moves forward on the tide of destiny. And what men that little rustic England could breed! A nation of five and a half millions that had Wren for its architect, Newton for its scientist, Bentley for its scholar, Pope for its satirist, Addison for its essayist, Bolingbroke for its orator, Swift for its pamphleteer and Marlborough to win its battles, had the recipe for genius.'

There could be small doubt of that, remembering the deeds done through the boldness and confidence of the English of those days. Yet the people who did not belong to the ruling and aristocratic class had to suffer plenty of restrictions. Favouritism, nepotism, and a system of patronage which worked as badly as any such system could do, kept the doors of progress firmly shut against the many for the benefit of the few, who, of course, were generally unfit for the opportunities thus artificially promoted for them. But the nation generally was blessed with a doggedness, a stupid rather than an inspired doggedness—we might say a bull-doggedness—which bluntly refused to take 'No' for an answer in spite of hard blows and apparently strong reasons by which it was backed. It was the time when Jack was not thought, by himself or by any one else, to be as good as his master;

yet the poorest wretch, living nakedly in a tub in the neighbourhood of the writing-hack's Grub Street, was perfectly convinced that any one true-blue British heart-of-oak could thrash in one 'go' any half-dozen foreigners, with a few frog-eating Frenchies added on. Mr Trevelyan looks with his normal charity at the crudeness and roughness of that time and possibly is right in doing so; but the realities depicted by Hogarth and the cartoonists who came after him disclose a very gross coarseness and brutality among all conditions of society. The sports of field and town, the public manners of the people, their lack of reticence, the roaring and shrieking laughter, sometimes at sorry or tortured animals and at the pitiful infirmities of human cripples, the filth and drunkenness, the hopeless squalor, the conditions of the prisons, the rank injustice of the laws, the general callous selfishness of the fortunate in their vanity and mean pride, are all made so evident in the contemporary drawings and writings that their reality cannot possibly be gainsaid.

In spite of all that, England was a lovely, and, in its boisterous manner, on the whole it was a happy country. The change from present circumstances is vividly exemplified by the fact that cattle for the Metropolis could be driven all the way by road from the farms where they were reared, grazing as they went; that the Thames was a silver river bearing pleasure-barges manned by jolly young watermen; and that from every house in every city or town green trees and glowing gardens could immediately be seen. The smoke of sea-coal fires was already polluting the wintry London air, disheartening the plodding housewife with its smuts; while in the wet season main thoroughfares were axle-deep in mud; but there was scope and space for ease and expansion everywhere, and the retrospect, so far as natural conditions went, appears enviable. Birds needed no guarded sanctuaries in which to nest. Wild life was plentiful and more than ever fascinating to those, ever the rare few, who had the heart to seek its beauties and wonders.

In the country the Sir Rogers and Squire Westerns lived their diversely beneficent parts amid prosperous acres of the finest pasture-land bearing stout herds and golden fields of corn. The lords of the manors made no mistake as to their superior position in relation to the

tenantry and peasantry; but with their common-sense administration of the local laws and their harvest festivities, field sports and fox-hunting, helped to keep the labourers contented and amused, and willing to bear the occasional hardship of their lot with a creditable spirit; though, doubtless, some necessary relief was found in the grumbling that was ever an Englishman's privilege. Out of those villages and the small towns, inland and by the sea, came the rough-handed, hearty men who endured incredible injustice and discomfort on the ships of the Navy and fought, like the heroes the songs made of them, under Rooke and Benbow; or they followed Marlborough in his wars. The Duke was unique among the generals and admirals of his time in his care for the welfare of his men. In his respect and regard for the rank-and-file he by far outshone Wellington. He was also an enlightened pioneer in Army reform. The result was that his soldiers trusted and loved him, and would have followed him anywhere—as they did. Such devotion on his part, and on theirs, may be regarded as making some amends for, if it does not entirely eliminate, the political tricks and treasons of which he was guilty, in an age when corruption and chicanery were finished instruments in the hands of the ministers and of the Opposition.

It was supremely a political age. The coffee-houses were crowded with opinionated gentlemen of all classes, prosperous, poverty-stricken, who would ransom a potentate or reduce his kingdom between two pinches of snuff. Pamphlets full of abuse were circulated, and insults, innuendoes, of the vilest kind were freely shouted or whispered; while Whigs and Tories hated and fought each other with a bitterness that now is almost unbelievable. Not only the coffee-houses and the hustings, but Parliament and the Queen's Court—her very household—were poisoned with intrigue and angers, so that no statesman could be sure of his motives being taken as honest and patriotic—even if they were so. Marlborough with his greatly beloved (by him) and often impossible Duchess used to the full such back-stair and keyhole business; but it is to his credit that notwithstanding the temptations and difficulties of his position he never forgot his responsibilities towards his Sovereign and Parliament. With all his falsities he was a constitu-

tionalist, recognising the reality and necessity of the fact that the soldier, however high his rank and fortunate his career, is the servant of the monarch and the people to whose representatives in the ministry he is bound to answer for all that he may do or may have neglected to do.

'Marlborough would not have been England's greatest leader in war if he had not understood the necessary relation between her war effort and her civil constitution. In that understanding he was not surpassed by Chatham himself. Long absences abroad, great victories in the field, the flattery of all Europe never made that cool head forget that he must answer for all he did to the Commons of England.'

Beyond the interest of Mr Trevelyan's survey of social, political, and warlike England, with the romantic figure of Marlborough emerging at its centre, to remain, at the end of his present volume, still in the glow of his triumph after Blenheim, we have a charming personal comment on some significant omissions from Macaulay's verbal picture of the great Duke. The impression left of Marlborough by that historian—who in these later years has rightly come to his happy restoration after a time of heavy depreciation—is one of almost unrelieved denunciation and contempt; but now we learn from his grand-nephew the reason why that was so. Macaulay died while the portrait was still incomplete. 'He instinctively desired to make Marlborough's genius stand out bright against the background of his villainy. He had blacked in the background, but did not live to put in the full-length figure of the victor of Blenheim in all his magnificent panoply.' It was, therefore, an unintended injustice; but it still was an injustice, one more of the many which followed the Duke.

On the whole, fortune was far more than kind to Marlborough. He won all the prizes that ambition could desire or dream of. Victory, an exalted position and influence, fortune, and a wife whom he adored. Although in his home he had deep sorrows through the deaths in their youth of his best-loved children, he received the happiest consolation from the devotion of his Sarah. He never failed to be her worshipful lover, giving her always his full trust. He remains an enigma, for his political motives and practices are still often obscure and difficult to disentangle. Was he really a traitor? The answer must be that by intention he really was one, as

also were nearly all his leading contemporaries. The insistent question of those days was 'Under which King, Bezonian, speak or die?' and it is not to be wondered at that, faced with so sharp and final a dilemma, men hesitated to speak, or else spoke falsely, being anxious to be safe if, after all vicissitudes, the other side won. There are episodes in Marlborough's career, such as his disclosure of the purposed attack on Brest, which are inexcusable, though Mr Trevelyan, in his desire to be fair, discovers even for that plain betrayal some possible excuse. Yet he was a great soldier, a great gentleman, a great man. Whatever his faults were, and they were grievous, he sinned with dignity, with grace, with charm; while in his private life and hidden heart, as his letters reveal, he had a natural simplicity and truth. But of how much value is such an explanation or excuse? He was a very complex individual, and no one can fully judge him. As the riddle cannot be surely read, it is, therefore, best to leave him in the glory rightly won through his unquestionably splendid services, and let that be the last impression:

'A Milord, every inch a soldier and a courtier; said indeed to be fifty years of age, but in the prime of manly beauty, with a complexion like a girl's; talking charmingly in bad French; seeming to understand all and sympathise with every one.'

JAMES WILSON.

Art. 11.—THE EVOLUTION OF SEX.

1. *Programme of the London Congress of the International Society for Sex Research*, 1930.
2. *The Evolution of Sex*. By Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson, 1889. And *Sex*, Thornton Butterworth, 1914.
3. *Essays of a Biologist*. By Julian Huxley. Chatto and Windus, 1923.
4. Article 'Sex,' *Encyclopædia Britannica*. By F. A. E. Crew. 1930 Edition.
5. *Geschlecht und Geschlechter*. J. Meisenheimer. Gustav Fischer, 1921 and 1930.
6. *Studies in Animal Behaviour*. By S. J. Holmes. 1906.
7. *Sex in Man and Animals*. By J. R. Baker. Routledge, 1926.
8. *The Study of Bird Behaviour*. By Eliot Howard. Cambridge University Press, 1929.
9. *The Biology of Spiders*. By Theodore H. Savory. Sidgwick and Jackson, 1926.

THE nature of sex remains a riddle ; that is to say the true inwardness of the difference between males and females is not yet understood. Two sea-urchins are externally as like one another as two peas, which may be deeply different, as Mendel showed, yet one produces egg-cells and the other sperm-cells ; and, though they are internally very much the same, we call the one female and the other male. With our eyes eventually, or by borrowing other lenses for earlier stages, we can distinguish the egg-producing sea-urchin from the sperm-producer, but we are still unable to say what lies behind this femaleness and maleness. Two threads of a mould appear to be microscopically identical, yet they will unite and combine their forces if they are of separate sexes, and remain indifferent if they are of the same sex. Yet we cannot say wherein the elusive differentia consists. As we shall see, speculation is possible, but certainty there is none.

Much progress, however, has been made since Darwin's day, and along various lines. (a) It is possible to study, in simple organisms like *Volvox*, what look like the first steps in the phyletic evolution of sex dimorphism, and

to follow the accentuation of the difference from grade to grade till we face males and females even more divergent than stag and hind, peacock and peahen—so divergent indeed that their first describers have been known to refer them to different species, as one might well do with Birds of Paradise, where the male is often exuberantly resplendent and the female an undecorated and soberly coloured little bird.

(b) Darwin knew so much and thought so deeply about sex-behaviour and preferential mating that modern advance along this line of study has not been startling. Yet our understanding of animal behaviour has deepened all along the line, especially as it has become more critical and experimental; and many naturalists would agree that Darwin's theory of preferential mating as a selective factor in evolution stands on a firmer basis than ever. In any case the phyletic advance of sex dimorphism shows a gradually increasing emphasis on the psychical aspect of mating—the subjective side, with its emotions and associations, counting for more than even Darwin supposed. In a deep sense the most important fact in the evolution of sex is the sublimation of mere physiological excitement by the warmth of psychical attractions. Studies such as Julian Huxley's 'Courtship of the Crested Grebe' and Eliot Howard's 'Sex Behaviour of Yellowhammers' show clearly that the mating of birds is far subtler than our teachers thought.

(c) And while it seems to us that marked progress in the study of sex has rewarded a more adequate recognition of the psychical factor in animal courtship, there is a correlated advance on the physiological side due to the discovery of the subtly pervasive influence of sex-hormones liberated from the reproductive organs and diffused throughout the body by the blood. A new epoch began with the discovery of the influence—now activating and again inhibiting—of these sex-hormones; and they again must have had their evolution. That they affect the inner subjective life, as well as the development of secondary sex-characters, is one of the largest facts in the story of the evolution of sex—profoundly important in the life of man as well as of beast. A female bird deprived of the normal ovarian regulation may put on masculine plumage after its next moult, and may also begin to exhibit a cock-

bird's ways and his temperament as well! Sex may be reversed in one and the same individual.

(d) The scientific air has been cleared in regard to the determination of sex, that is to say, the factors that determine whether a given fertilised egg-cell will develop into a male or into a female organism. For many of the old theories have gone by the board entirely, and in many cases it is certain that the sex of a developing embryo depends upon something in the original constitution of the originative germ-cell—a something which is often expressed in the chromosomal composition of the germ-cell nuclei. In many insects the egg-cell will develop into a female if it is fertilised by a sperm-cell with the same number (n) of chromosomes, and into a male if it is fertilised by a sperm-cell with that number less one ($n-1$). In other words, a fertilised egg-cell with two sex-chromosomes will develop into a female, and one with a single sex-chromosome will develop into a male. It is possible that these sex-chromosomes or accessory chromosomes contain doses of a ferment, and that the sex of the offspring depends on whether the dose is double or single. But, as we shall see, there are many cases where the issue cannot be stated so precisely, and may, indeed, remain so puzzling that we have some sympathy with the desperate ingenuity of some of the old-fashioned theories.

It should be added that apart from the progress in the science of sex, there has been some progress in the attitude of public opinion. The subject is no longer taboo; sunlight has been let in to its discussion; and it is being increasingly recognised that the adolescents of modern times require some guidance in regard to the sex-urge just as in old tribal days. Chivalry and love are flowers which cannot be historically separated from the subterranean physiological sex-roots, which are sometimes of the earth earthy.

To sum up: The essential nature of the difference between the egg-producer (female) and the sperm-producer (male) remains obscure, but progress has been made (a) in recognising phyletic stages in the evolution of sex-dimorphism; (b) in the study of sex-behaviour in general and preferential mating in particular; (c) in the discovery of the rôle of sex-hormones in the individual life and also in racial evolution; and (d) in the analysis

of the factors that determine the sex of the developing organism. Moreover, while the ethical and social difficulties and pathologies of the imperious sex-urge remain in great part unconquered, they are being increasingly faced in the daylight of understanding.

The simplest organisms, without any multicellular body, continue their kind by dividing into two or into many units (fission, budding, and spore-formation); and though an individual A may be said to disappear into B and C or more, this does not affect the freedom from Natural Death which distinguishes Life's simplest children. For we cannot speak of natural death if there is nothing at all left to bury. As Weismann maintained, the unicellulars enjoy an organic immortality. Natural death was the price paid for having a body.

But while the Protozoa and Protophytes multiply asexually by various forms of division, they also show the first hints of sex. In the life-history of the beautiful Bell-animalcule, *Vorticella*, a minute free-swimming individual (formed by repeated division from an attached form) attaches itself to one of normal size and bores into it—a process of conjugation associated with complicated nuclear reductions and re-combinations just as in the fertilisation of an egg-cell by a sperm-cell. It is plain that in this unequal 'total conjugation,' of which there are many instances, the minute free-swimming unit that effects entrance may be compared to a male organism or to a sperm-cell, while the larger, more passive unit that receives the other may be compared to a female organism or to an egg-cell. There are many cases in which the unicellular animals give origin to two kinds of specialised reproductive units or gametes—larger, less active macrogametes, and smaller, more active microgametes, which unite in conjugation; and it would be shutting one's eyes to the obvious not to see in this the beginning of sex. There are all sorts of diversities and complexities, as in the partial conjugation of many types, like the Slipper Animalcule (*Paramecium*), where the two conjugants exchange parts of their nuclei and then separate again—the mutual fertilisation probably serving to promote variability and to sustain the vigour of the stock. Here we move quickly on thin ice, but there is no doubt as to the large fact that unicellular organisms often show the analogues

of males and females, and of their sex-union ; and it is no hypothesis, but a fact of observation, that the one kind of unit tends to be relatively more anabolic, i.e. with a preponderance of constructive metabolism, while the other lives more nearly up to its income, and has a relatively larger denominator in the universal vital ratio of Anabolism to Katabolism, or $\frac{A}{K}$. This, according to Patrick

Geddes's theory of 1889, is the deep constitutional alternative beneath all the detailed differences of maleness and femaleness. To sum up : The first hints of sex-dimorphism are to be found in the contrast between micro- and macrogametes among unicellular organisms, and this admits of physiological interpretation in terms of changes in the ratio between the anabolic and the katabolic processes in metabolism.

Here it may be shrewdly objected that it is one thing to compare microgamete and macrogamete to sperm-cell and egg-cell respectively, but another thing to compare them to male and female organisms. Thus we pass to the next great step in the evolution of sex, which is well illustrated by the story of *Volvox*. This is a beautiful green ball, sometimes the size of a pin's head, which is occasionally found swimming in a spiral in freshwater pools. Whether it be claimed by the botanist or by the zoologist, or by neither, matters not at present, for our interest is in the fact that the various forms of this type present an epitome of sex-possibilities. In a colony of *Volvox aureus* or *minor* there are 500-1,000 individuals, in *Volvox globator* about 10,000, all embedded in a gelatinous matrix and forming a hollow sphere—eloquently indicative of an early attempt at body-making. For *Volvox* is a colony of unicellulars, a hint of the ancient bridge spanning the gulf between Protozoa (or Protophytes) and Metazoa (or Metaphytes). Each unit is a cell, with two lashes or flagella, a nucleus, a pigment spot, and chlorophyll corpuscles ; and each unit is linked by protoplasmic bridges to its nearest neighbours. Observing this interesting living pinhead, we see that it often multiplies by the internal segregation of cells which divide and re-divide, and develop into daughter-colonies. These eventually escape by the bursting of the parent colony, so that natural death and asexual reproduction are at once illustrated. But

there are other colonies of *V. globator*, in which cells, resembling those that may form daughter-colonies, divide and re-divide into numerous minute, yellowish, motile sperm-cells, while others, appearing somewhat later, grow into relatively large and sluggish egg-cells. These are fertilised by sperm-cells. In the smaller species, *Volvox aureus*, a colony is usually an egg-producer or a sperm-producer, but it may be both; and in some cases its ova may develop parthenogenetically. Now when a colony, segregating special cells, produces spermatozoa only, or ova only, we have evidently to do with males and females respectively. Life has crossed one of its Rubicons; and it is interesting to find Klein recording no fewer than twenty-four different forms of *Volvox aureus*, from the quite asexual to the parthenogenetic, for there may be almost entirely male colonies, almost entirely female colonies, and other transitional stages. There is some evidence that the occurrence of this, that, or the other reproductive phase depends on outside influences, and the probability is that continued experiments will show how to make a daughter-colony develop into a male or into a female, or into a hermaphrodite, or into an inter-sex, and so on.

To sum up: The establishment of differentiated sex implies (1) the segregation of special reproductive units as contrasted with the ordinary somatic cells; (2) the dimorphism of these cells towards sluggish, relatively anabolic ova and active, relatively katabolic sperms; and (3) the specialisation of two types of individual as egg-producers and sperm-producers respectively. And all this can be seen in the simple multicellular organism—*Volvox*.

In the contrast between a *Volvox*-ball producing sperms only and another producing egg-cells only, there is in principle the sex-dimorphism that is seen so conspicuously in many animal types, e.g. stag and hind, ruff and reeve, and often occurs, though usually in difficult disguise, among plants as well. But what are the chief elaborations between the preliminary steps in *Volvox* and the high-level contrasts, e.g. between male and female Birds of Paradise which we find it difficult to regard as belonging to the same species? There are three main elaborations. First, there are correlated adaptations which

make the functions of the two sexes organically more perfect, thus to the female there may be added arrangements which secure the equipment of the eggs or the embryos with food or with protecting envelopes. Similarly on the male side, there may be an addition of organs which make the fertilisation of the eggs less fortuitous or the insemination of the females more effective. The sea-urchins have only the essential reproductive organs or gonads (the ovaries, producing ova, and the testes, producing spermatozoa); and it is obviously a very fortuitous and, so to speak, wasteful method of continuing the race that clouds of egg-cells and sperm-cells should be set adrift into the sea. There was room for improvement; and good instances of desirable improvements are seen in the encradling 'pouch' of most female Marsupials and in the 'claspers' of male Gristly Fishes.

Secondly, in the evolution of the sexes there has been an addition of less essential secondary sex-characters, masculine and feminine features, which may make pairing more secure and may sometimes form the basis of preferential mating. Among mammals one recalls the lion's mane, the stag's antlers, the narwhal's tusk, the duckmole's spur. Among birds one recalls the peacock's tail, the eyed wing-feathers of the Argus Pheasant, the decorations of male Birds of Paradise, the tail of the Lyre-bird. At lower levels every one knows the male frog's swollen first finger, the old male salmon's hooked lower jaw, the frequently greater brilliance of male butterflies, the big horns of certain male beetles. Convenient surveys are to be found in Darwin's 'Descent of Man,' Cunningham's 'Sexual Dimorphism' and Geddes and Thomson's 'Sex' in the Home University Library. The evolution of these secondary sex-characters is an interesting problem by itself; and it will be remembered that it gave rise to one of the few radical cleavages between Darwin and his magnanimous colleague, Alfred Russel Wallace.

Thirdly, among Vertebrate animals there came about a very important physiological linkage—by no means easy to account for—between specialised sex-hormones (or gonadal internal secretions) produced in the ripening gonads and distributed throughout the body by the blood. This is another long story, becoming, it seems, more intricate every year, but it is enough at present to notice

that the activation or the development of many secondary sex-characters depends on the presence or absence of hormones from the reproductive organs. Thus the extraordinarily rapid annual growth of the antlers of stags requires that a specific hormone from the testes should reach the frontal region of the head. Contrariwise it is well known for some birds that a removal of the normally inhibiting influence of the ovary allows the development of masculine characters which remain in ordinary circumstances quite latent. Every one would like to know more about the endocrinal or hormone-making tissue in the gonads of reindeer (where both sexes have antlers), and in the Phalarope (where the female is the more decorative bird).

Fourthly, it seems legitimate to say that another line of evolution involved an increased 'sexing' of the body, or, if the phrase be objected to, an increased influencing of the body by the fundamental sex difference or by such correlates as the sex-hormones. We do not know that there is any difference between the body of a male and a female sea-urchin, but in some organisms the application of the Manoilov and similar tests (in using which a little we have obtained, we must admit, very conflicting, yet not unintelligible, results) show pervasive differences in the blood and extracts and even sap of the body. As Havelock Ellis says: 'A man is a man to his very thumbs, and a woman is a woman down to her little toes.' The extreme accentuation of what we are hinting at is seen in such cases as the difference between the female Paper Nautilus, maternal within her exquisite cradle-shell, and the pigmy naked male, with one of his arms transformed into a detachable worm-like 'hectocotylus,' capable for a time of independent movement, and set adrift within the mantle-cavity of the female. So in other extreme cases of pigmy males, the whole body has been changed, as is natural enough if the theory we stand for be true that the two sexes differ fundamentally in the ratio of anabolic and katabolic processes in their metabolism.

Fifthly, but to be returned to later, another step in the evolution of sex throughout the ages has been the increasing expression allowed to the subjective or mental side. Affection is added to appetite.

To sum up: The evolution of sex-dimorphism, after its

first establishment, has implied (1) the addition of accessory organs, favouring parental division of labour; (2) the appearance of secondary sex-characters, often of survival value in attraction and mating; (3) the physiological correlation of the activity or development of sex-characters with the production and diffusion of sex-hormones; (4) the influencing of the body by the sex-differences; and (5) the increased expression of the psychical aspect.

Asexual reproduction by division and budding continues to high levels among animals, as in the Tunicates, which are to be ranked with Vertebrates, and it is not unknown among Flowering Plants, as the Tiger-Lily's detachable bulbils remind us. Yet the larger fact is that with the establishment of a body, whether in animal or plant, there was associated the differentiation of sexual reproduction. Thus, with few exceptions, almost all animals from Sponges to Man multiply by egg-cells which are fertilised by sperm-cells. What advantages has sexual reproduction over asexual that the replacement of the latter by the former should be so general?

Various advantages may be indicated. (a) The sexual method by means of special germ-cells makes it possible for the organism to produce more offspring at one time and, in ordinary cases, with less physiological strain or expense than asexual multiplication would allow. (b) Separating off a relatively large bud or fraction of the body is hardly thinkable in the more highly differentiated and integrated organisms, though its occurrence in Tunicates warns us against dogmatism. (c) When offspring arise as relatively large detached samples of the parent's body, there is an obvious risk that they may start with disabilities acquired by the parental body. When there are segregated germ-cells, there is less risk of this handicapping; they are very much apart from the everyday bustle of metabolism, though no one supposes that they live a charmed life within the body that bears them. (d) In a way that we do not fully understand, there may be an advantage in the periodic impliciting of the organism, in its generational sequence, into a one-cell phase of being. There is undoubtedly a fresh unification at the beginning of each individual life. (e) In the asexual propagation of certain cultivated plants, such as potatoes, there is often

a tendency to accumulate weaknesses and to lose excellencies, a disadvantage less likely to ensue when there is sexual reproduction, and especially when there is cross-fertilisation. (f) But greatest of all, probably, is the fact that in the life-history of the germ-cells, and in the mingling (amphimixis, as Weismann well called it) of sperm-cell and egg-cell in fertilisation, there is abundant opportunity for new permutations and combinations of hereditary qualities—for new departures or variations, in short. Here is surely the crowning advantage of sexual reproduction, that it favours the emergence of the new!

But it may be legitimate to look further ahead and recognise that sexual reproduction in animals leads on to separate sexes, often very dimorphic, whence evolved courtship, the dawn of the love of mates, and the strengthening of parental and other emotions. We must avoid the teleological fallacy of trying to account for origins by indicating their useful fruits, but, since Organic Evolution has come about by prolonged proving of all things and holding fast to that which is good, it is legitimate to point out the survival value of sexual, as contrasted with asexual, reproduction. The evolution of sex has been a prolegomenon to at least many of the moral and religious ideas that we hold most sacred. We cannot tell what 'Love' would mean in a sexless world of life.

To sum up: Sexual, as contrasted with asexual reproduction, has been justified in many ways, e.g. by lessening the physiological expensiveness of the process, by reducing the risk of continuing somatic disabilities from generation to generation, by stimulating the emergence of the new, and by far-off fruits of high human value. Sex has been a potent factor in Organic as in Social Evolution.

The outcome of the evolution, as every one recognises, has been the establishment of separate sexes, which, if not markedly dimorphic—as is true only in a minority of cases—are nevertheless very different from one another in constitution and character, in moods and habits. Can we make an average contrast between males and females?

MALE

Sperm-producer.
 With less expensive reproduction.
 More intense metabolism.
 Relatively more katabolic.
 Often with shorter life.
 Often smaller.
 Often more brilliantly coloured and more decorative.
 Rising to more intense outbursts of energy.
 More impetuous and experimental.
 More divergent from the youthful type.
 Often more variable.
 Making more of sex-gratification.

FEMALE

Egg-producer.
 With much more expensive reproduction.
 Less intense metabolism.
 Relatively more anabolic.
 Often with longer life.
 Often larger.
 Often quieter in colour and plainer in decoration.
 Capable of more patient endurance.
 More persistent and conservative.
 Nearer the youthful type.
 Often less variable.
 Making more of the family.

It is interesting to find in Heape's 'Sex Antagonism' (1913) an independent parallel: 'The Male and the Female individual may be compared in various ways with the spermatozoon and ovum. The Male is active and roaming, he hunts for his partner and is an expender of energy; the Female is passive, sedentary, one who waits for her partner and is a conservator of energy.'

We hold by the unifying physiological theory due to the fertile mind of Professor Patrick Geddes, and first argued for in our joint-book 'The Evolution of Sex' (1889), that the fundamental difference between male and female is in the rate and rhythm of their metabolism. In all metabolism there is a see-saw between up-building, constructive anabolism and down-breaking, disruptive katabolism. The photosynthesis of a green leaf, in which complex carbon-compounds are built up, is a characteristically anabolic process, while the combustion associated with the contraction of a muscle is as markedly katabolic. A female cochineal insect, heavily laden with the reserve-product carmine, is highly anabolic; an adult male Ephemerid in its brief ecstasy of aerial life, never pausing to eat, is as strikingly katabolic. Unless an organism is living on its past, as it often does for a time, the numerator

of the ratio $\frac{A}{K}$ must always be larger than the denominator ; but one phase or type may differ from another in the *relative* preponderance of anabolic and katabolic processes. Now the physiological theory of sex is simply that the primary difference between the sexes is one of physiological gearing. Femaleness is the outcome of relatively preponderant anabolism, and maleness of the reverse ; that is to say, in organisms of the same weight the ratio $\frac{A}{K}$ in the female is greater than the ratio $\frac{a}{k}$ in the male.

In support of this physiological theory of sex, the following considerations, among others, may be advanced.

(1) The distinction between male and female is very general in its manifold expression, and one would expect it to rest on some very primary organismal difference, and none is more primary than the varying ratio between anabolism and katabolism.

(2) The female is by definition a producer of eggs or macrogametes, often relatively large, often laden with nutritive reserves or yolk ; the male is by definition a producer of sperms or microgametes, usually, though not always, *very* minute, with little cytoplasm, and intensely active. To produce egg-cells is physiologically congruent with being of a relatively anabolic constitution, and conversely for sperms, though it is easy to understand that certain males, like drakes and rams, have relatively large testes, in adaptation probably to an ecological need for a huge production of sperms.

(3) The contrast between the characteristic sex-cells—the ovum and spermatozoon—is, as it were, in miniature, a suggestion of the contrast between the sexes themselves. No doubt the egg-cell is adaptively larger than the sperm-cell, since it has to provide initial building-material and perhaps some nutriment for the embryo into which it develops ; no doubt the sperm-cell is adaptively minute and explosively motile since it has to find the egg-cell which it fertilises ; but the point is that behind the secondary adaptive divergence there is the fact that the two contrasted cells give expression to the most fundamental of alternatives in the chemical routine of living matter, that is to say the metabolism of protoplasm. It

must be clearly understood that there is no sex in the ovum as such, for one ovum may develop into a female and its neighbour into a male; and similarly among sperms. We are simply indicating that there is a parallelism between male and female organisms and the contrasted types of germ-cells. But there is obviously more than parallelism in cases where there are in one animal two kinds of ova, larger ones which develop into females and smaller ones which develop into males.

(4) When a wide survey is taken of males and females, often including their masculine and feminine characters, if these are recognisable, it often seems good sense to interpret the differences as expressions of a primary bias to relatively anabolic or relatively katabolic predominance. Thus larger, more reserve-weighted, more easy-going females are what might be expected, and conversely. The source of fallacy here, however, is that a feminine character may be adaptive to the particular functions of the sex, and may have been established in the course of time by the selection of germinal variations. Our point, however, is that behind the secondary adaptations there is the fundamental metabolic antithesis, with which the details of femininity and masculinity are often congruent. A female may be secondarily larger than the male because she is the outcome of selection towards carrying and feeding the young, but she is primarily larger because she is a preponderatingly anabolic female.

(5) In some cases it is certain that the sex of the offspring is already settled in the egg-cell, and in some of these cases there are two kinds of egg-cells which differ in the degree of their metabolic bias towards anabolism. In the simplest cases there are large eggs and small, the former developing into females, the latter into males. Even when maleness and femaleness behave as Mendelian characters, it may be that the accessory sex chromosome, whose presence or absence, singleness or doubleness, shows which sex will develop from the fertilised ovum, is only a symptom of a deeper physiological difference, or is only effective through the type of metabolism which it helps to set up. It will be understood that in all ordinary cases each germ-cell is equipped with complete sets of male and female, masculine and feminine, here-

ditary factors or genes ; which set will develop depends on the cytoplasmic soil, and, on our theory, on the metabolic ratio.

(6) In some cases it seems as though the bias of egg-cells towards female-production or male-production is not irrevocably settled from the first, but can be swayed to one side or the other for some brief period, e.g. by the relative ripeness of the two germ-cells, or by nutritive conditions ; and we venture to say that in some of these cases the conditions favouring female-production are those that favour anabolic preponderance.

(7) The metabolic theory of sex is corroborated by cases where the animal changes its sex in the course of its life, being first male and then female, like the hagfish ; or first female and then male, like some Tunicata.

(8) Similarly suggestive, we think, are those cases where parasitic castration—as in some male crabs—is followed by a change in the constitution of the blood, and then by a degeneration of the male organs, which may proceed to develop a number of ova. Very striking in these cases is the change of some of the limbs from a masculine to a feminine form.

(9) There are many facts which suggest the need of some physiological supplement to the theory that maleness and femaleness are merely Mendelian characters carried by a sex-chromosome. Such a fact is the reversal of sex—say, in a hen or a duck—when the removal of the ovary, with the consequent cessation of the inhibitory influence of its hormone, allows masculine characters to find expression. Another is the possibility of distinguishing the sexes by biochemical tests, like those of Manoilov, applied to the blood, the sap, the expressed juices, and so forth. The reason for frequent failure with this test may be, as Professor Oscar Riddle suggests, that although the organism experimented with is definitely a male or a female, its somatic metabolism may sway in the opposite direction within limits, e.g. according to age, season, and nutrition. His general verdict is that the numerous studies that have been made with the Manoilov test have notably extended the evidence for the metabolic theory of sex. Also worthy of consideration is the familiar fact that, apart from the casual occurrence of some grade of hermaphroditism in normally unisexual creatures, such as

some butterflies, fishes, and frogs, there are often masculoid females and feminoid males.

(10) Finally, it may be pointed out that if the dichotomy between male and female is primarily and throughout evolution a question of altered metabolic ratio towards relatively increased anabolism or katabolism, the mystery of sex comes into line with other great dichotomies, e.g. between animals and plants, between active and sluggish cells, between Infusorians and Rhizopods, between jellyfishes and sea-anemones, even between average reptiles and average birds. What if it is an expression of the fundamental alternative in organic variation?

To sum up: The physiological or metabolic theory of sex maintains that the difference between maleness and femaleness is primarily a difference in the rate and ratio of metabolism. The sexes differ primarily in their physiological gearing. The female is an organism in which the ratio of anabolism to katabolism ($\frac{A}{K}$) is greater than the corresponding ratio in the male, that is to say, the numerator of the fraction in the female is always larger in proportion to the denominator. This view should be considered not in opposition, but as a supplement to the theory that interprets sex dimorphism as wholly adaptive, or the conclusion that maleness and femaleness behave as Mendelian characters.

In the lower stretches of the ascent of life, sex is relatively simple. The liberation of sex-cells or some associated physiological relief is brought about by the contact of the males and females; or it may be that the propinquity of the one sex serves as a stimulus to the other. When the female salmon deposits her eggs one after another in the gravelly bed of the river, the attendant male reacts with a discharge of fertilising milt. In the Suez sea-urchin the reproductive organs fill and empty every summer month, and they say that when one has begun to discharge its sex-cells, this serves as a liberating stimulus all along the line. In some types, where no visual stimulus is possible, the effect of propinquity, though observed, is not at present intelligible. Where there is actual contact between the sexes the physiology of the stimulus can be readily understood, especially when it rises to all sorts of fondlings of low and high degree.

What a gamut from the coupling earthworms by the way-side to the caresses of doves! How quaint the discharge of a calcareous arrow (*spiculum amoris*) or Cupid's Dart between two pairing snails, hermaphrodite, like the earthworms, but none the less stringently cross-fertilising! Yet quaintest is the way in which some of the male Octopuses (e.g. the pigmy mate of the Paper Nautilus) give off an arm in marriage, reflexly amputating into the mantle-cavity of the female a whole arm, transformed as a vehicle for tens of thousands of spermatozoa, packed into extraordinary explosive cartridges. Instead of continuing these illustrations, let us refer in more detail to spiders and yellowhammers.

It is a matter for regret that popular imagination has been so much impressed by the fact that a female spider sometimes puts an end to her suitor's advances by seizing, killing, and sucking him. For the incident is far from being typical, and to interpret it as the female's short-tempered retaliation on a too-imfortunate wooer is probably erroneous. What are the facts? In many kinds of spiders there is a striking sex-dimorphism. The males are often like living jewels, while the females are plain; the males are often pigmies compared with the females. The difference, translated into human dimensions, would have its counterpart if a man about six feet in height and 150 pounds in weight were to wed a woman 200,000 pounds in weight and the height of a country-church steeple. The dimorphism sounds very grotesque in human terms, yet the proportions are real enough among spiders. It should also be noted that the males usually make inferior webs, and that some steal their food from their mate's web. Moreover, the mode of sex-union is very remarkable, for a pair of the male's mouth-appendages (pedipalps) become transformed and laden with packets of sperms, and are thrust into the genital aperture of the female—an almost unique mode of insemination. In some ways, no doubt, the sex-relations among spiders are farouche and more than a little strained. But the key to these relations is largely to be found in the simple fact that many of the short-sighted spiders are instinctively (i.e. hereditarily) compelled to seize small, quickly-moving, insect-like creatures, treating them as booty. Hence we see the shrewdness of Mr Bristowe's

recently expressed theory that the all-important behaviour on the male spider's part is to be able to announce himself as such to his desired mate. In some way or other, before the trigger of the booty-catching instinct is pulled, he must be able to say to her: 'Steady! I am not an insect. I am only your very humble servant, your lover, for short.'

Thus we are not surprised to find an extraordinary variety of ways in which male spiders announce themselves to their desired mates. The first point is to make it quite clear that they are what they are—lovers, not titbits; and the second point is to arouse the female's interest and sex-excitement. From a safe radius the Garden Spider will signal by means of vibrations passing along a silken line to the female's web or nest. If the reaction is unfavourable, he can beat a retreat and try his luck some other day. Another species poses at a short distance and shows off his good points of coloration and decorativeness. Some of the Hunting Spiders, or *Attidæ*, display themselves in a round-dance in the vicinity of the female, sometimes circling over a hundred times, yet ready to run away if the female shows herself in an aggressive mood. Almost incredible at this low level on the inclined plane of animal behaviour is the way in which a male species brings an edible gift to his desired mate; and it is very interesting that if a male of a gift-expecting species presents himself without his offering, or is notably perfunctory in the ritual, he may pay for his negligence with his life. This throws a new light on the so-called cannibalism of female spiders.

Since each species of spider has its own sexual behaviour, from the crude to the subtle, the term instinctive may be used in its stricter sense. There is an inborn or hereditary predisposition to exhibit a routine of reactions, characteristic of each type, and more or less perfectly effective without requiring any learning or apprenticeship. But for reasons which are not relevant for the moment, we regard instinctive behaviour as suffused with awareness, sometimes rising to enjoyment, and, as backed by endeavour, sometimes rising to purposiveness! When we pass from spiders to birds the sex-behaviour rises in psychical pitch.

In his recent studies (1929) of the courtship behaviour

of the Yellowhammer, the Reed Bunting, and their relatives—studies marked by patient thoroughness of observation and by cautiousness in drawing conclusions—Mr Elliot Howard shows how far simplicity is from the truth and how impossible it is to make sense of the story without allowing for mind as a *vera causa* throughout. Mental images are operative as well as hormones. There is considerable diversity of behaviour between related species, and even between individuals of the same species; but let us attempt an impressionist picture, with particular reference to the Yellowhammer. The first chapter is the male's choice of a 'territory' or centre of activities. It may be a low tree or a furze bush—some site that pleases him; there he sings and thence he drives away intruders. Sometimes 'love' will temporarily wane and 'hunger' assert its claims, and the cock will condescend to join his fellows feeding on the fields. Suddenly, however, in the midst of his meal, he will remember his territory and hie back in haste to his post of expectancy, where he sings and fights, fights and sings, and keeps his eyes open for a mate.

The second chapter begins with the occasional, almost casual, visits of females, not much interested at first either in the place or in the brilliant little songster. The female lags behind the male in physiological maturity, and she seems to be rather bored by his advances. She cuts them short by flying off to the fields, or she may pay a nonchalant visit to another male. Gradually, however, she becomes more interested in one place and then in one person; she returns at frequent intervals to the same 'territory'; she will share in the defence of the preserve against intruders; she becomes constitutionally marriage-ripe, tinder to the male's spark. He ceases, for the time being, to sing, but he pays her much attention in other ways. The pairing is accomplished.

The third chapter is honeymooning, when sex attraction is dominant. The female is now as exacting as the male formerly tried to be. Soon, however, a new note is struck, for the nest-making instinct begins to find expression. Two or three grass stems are gathered, and dropped again indifferently; a vigorous start is made, but the foundations are left unbuilt on; the male may experiment on his own account, as if he felt that things were not

getting on very quickly. After a week or more, the typical nest—surely a work of instinctive art—is started in earnest and finished very rapidly. Then egg-laying begins. For the season, at least, there seems to be faithful monogamy between the cock and hen yellowhammer.

The next chapter is the incubation of the eggs—a patience in which both sexes play their part—and the nurture of the nestlings—a labour of love in which the cock-bird seems to excel his mate. The sex-urge wanes in them both; the parental instinct grows strong, particularly, perhaps, in the male, in whom it lasts longer, even after the youngsters are well advanced. In some cases, Mr Howard says, it is the male's parental care that eventually saves the situation as far as the welfare of the family is concerned. But the big fact which Mr Howard seems to us to prove beyond doubt is the indispensability of mind if we are to make sense of the whole behaviour. There is a psychological story as well as a physiological story.

The story of the evolution of sex must include an account of the varied relations of the sexes in their associations with one another; whether, for instance, there is promiscuity, or polygyny, or polyandry, or monogamy. These and other relations are all illustrated in the panorama (or should one say Pan-drama) of *Animal Life*; and we must be careful not to look at them through ethical spectacles, which are not relevant except for mankind. Animals may be affectionate or surly, good lovers or lights-o'-love, highly-sexed or severely continent, but they do not 'think the ought'; they do not control their behaviour in reference to ideas of right and wrong, for they have not more than adumbrations of these. It is interesting that the dog, which is one of the few mammals with a hint of conscience, should have evolved in domestication in close partnership with its master's endeavours, a co-operation in which the sense of responsibility would be likely to dawn. Yet, so far as we know, animals do not rise intellectually to the level of building up any general ideas or concepts; and without moral ideas there can be no ethical life. Many animals have the raw materials of various virtues, but, poor creatures, they do not attain to the level of ethical conduct. Thus, in regard to the behaviour of the sexes among animals, the ethical problem does not arise. Yet the scientific inquiry remains,

whether this, that, or the other sex-relation among animals, though passing muster under the scrutiny of survival-value, has led to an enhancement of the life of the type. In the case of the Bilharzia-worm, such a formidable endoparasite of man (happily countered by modern science), the male becomes permanently associated with the longer and more slender female and carries her about in a 'gynæcophoric canal'—illustrating a quaint and dark by-path in the evolution of sex. But no one would propose to argue from the success of the sex-relations of this vermine parasite that it is a husband's duty to support his wife!

One of the most extraordinary of modern biological stories is the account of the sex-parasitism of several Angler-fishes which we owe to Dr Tate Regan, of the British Museum, probably the most distinguished of living ichthyologists. In a number of small Angler-fishes, related to the common Fishing Frog (*Lophius piscatorius*) of inshore waters, but living in the dimly-lighted, sparsely-populated mid-waters of the Deep Sea, the pigmy male is carried by the larger female with his mouth closed on some protuberance of her body. Sometimes he is borne, like a tassel, on the front of her head; sometimes on her gill-cover; sometimes behind the pectoral fin ('under her oxters,' so to speak); but in all cases the tissues and blood-vessels of his mouth-region have coalesced with those of his bearer, and all his food is obtained from this vascular continuity. His sole function is to liberate sperms when the female, who bears him, liberates ova; and the continuity of the blood-stream between the two sexes probably secures the requisite simultaneity of stimulus. In many fishes the male is smaller than the female, sometimes much smaller; and given this dimorphism we can understand that the occurrence of these pigmy mid-water male anglers as parasites on the females is probably an outcome of a process of quaint adaptation which has had survival-value in securing fertilisation in very empty haunts where encounters are few and far between. The quaint association seems to work well, as far as the race is concerned, but no one would propose to base on these Ceratidid Anglers an argument in favour of wives supporting their husbands!

In his prolonged study of Barnacles, Charles Darwin was

much interested to find that in many of these head-fixed sedentary Crustaceans there are pigmy 'complemental' males, which live attached to the typical form and have practically no function save to secure the fertilisation, or rather the cross-fertilisation, of the ova. In a number of parasitic crustaceans with separate sexes the female carries about a degenerate pigmy male, free-swimming in early youth, but after attachment little more than a little sac of spermatozoa. We cannot call these degenerate pigmy males pathological, for they are of normal occurrence in the species, but if the changes the males undergo through the dominance of the reproductive function cannot be called disintegrative (as disease always is), they are certainly degenerative in the extreme. As an antithesis on the female side may be mentioned the queen white ant, or termite, whose posterior body is bloated with eggs till it may be as long as our middle finger, though less than the nail of our little finger when the prolific maternity first set in. Lying prone in her royal chamber, fed rather than feeding, unable, if she would, to leave by the door by which she entered, the prisoner-queen produces many thousands of eggs in a day for many days on end. Not pathological, perhaps, but an extreme of maternity. The abdomen often swells from half an inch to four inches—dilated with food and with eggs. No fewer than 30,000 eggs may be liberated in a day, and 10,000,000 in a year. An individual queen's spate of reproductivity may continue for ten years, as man knows to his cost. But we cannot pass from these prolific termites without noticing some of the complexities in their sex-relations. Besides the ordinary winged males who inseminate the ordinary females while they also are winged, there are two different kinds of complemental or reserve males and females, who do not seem to be promoted to functionality unless some evil befalls the royal pair. Interesting also is the fact that the sex-arrest which usually affects the vast majority of the females in the servile state of social bees and ants, and results in the development of the workers, affects both sexes among the termites, where the workers and soldiers are arrested male and female individuals. A larval stage which is normally fated to become a worker (or a soldier) may be so nurtured by the community that it passes into the reproductive

caste, but this can only happen when it is taken young. Once an adult worker, always a worker; and so in the army. But in our present inquiry it is very interesting to find that there may be dimorphism among the workers and soldiers, masculoid and feminoid forms, somatic sex cropping out even when there is no sex!

Of all the instances of sex-dimorphism the most striking is that seen in the green sea-worm *Bonellia*, which is not uncommon in shallow water in the Mediterranean, and also occurs in the North Sea and elsewhere. The female has a body about the size and shape of a prune, and this is ensconced in a hole among the rocks. From the mouth end there extends a muscular ciliated proboscis, ending in two lobes; it may protrude for a foot or more, and is used in the collection of minute nutritive organisms or particles. The green colour is due to a somewhat peculiar green pigment (bonellein)—but that is neither here nor there at present. In due time the female liberates fertilised ova, and these develop into free-swimming larvæ which look as if they were all alike. If one of these free-swimming larvæ sinks down into the muddy substratum, it continues to develop and grow, and becomes a female. But if one of the larvæ settles down on the proboscis of an adult female, it undergoes arrest of development and becomes a mere pigmy without even a mouth or food-canal. It does not grow beyond $\frac{1}{16}$ of an inch in length, and it is practically a locomotor male organ. After sojourning for a time in the female's mouth, and undergoing further change, it passes to the female genital duct and remains there, with others like itself, for the rest of its life—fertilising the eggs of a mate a million times larger!

The Swiss zoologist, Baltzer, has shown that if the young larva remains for a short time on the proboscis of an adult and then falls off into the mud, it proceeds to develop into a female; while if it remains for a longer period, but not long enough, it develops into an inter-sex form. What is it that happens during the larva's stay on the proboscis of an adult? Baltzer answers that the larva absorbs a secretion of the skin, which inhibits somatic development and makes for nanism. By delicate staining methods it has been possible to prove the absorption of the skin secretion, and by neat experiments it has been possible to show that the probably toxic secretion has a

depressing and degenerative effect on various small animals exposed to its influence. This story of *Bonellia* is not only a picturesque instance of sex-dimorphism, but it strongly suggests the physiological theory of sex suggested in 'The Evolution of Sex' in 1889. Nutritional differences sway the larva in a male or a female direction, and the female is preponderatingly anabolic while the male is the reverse. Goldschmidt maintains that there are from the first male and female larvæ, before they assume divergent life-habits, but this interpretation has not been proved.

In many of the lower animals, especially in the sea, there are no personal relations between the sexes. The fleets of jellyfishes liberate their multitudinous egg-cells and sperm-cells into the water, 'so fertile be the floods in generation' (as Spenser exclaimed), but there is no pairing, and the fertilising is external and fortuitous. So is it also with starfishes, though these are often highly-sexed animals in the sense that a large part of the energy of the body is devoted to producing germ-cells. Professor Mortensen has estimated the annual production of eggs at 200,000,000 in *Luidia ciliaris*, and the number of sperms must be much greater. In many fishes that swim gregariously, like herring, there is this fortuitous external fertilisation, which would be oftener futile if it were not for the large numbers in the shoal and the frequent simultaneity in the liberation of the two kinds of germ-cells.

A second grade is represented by animals that show some degree of personal relation, but linger at the level of promiscuity. Any ripe female may be amorously excited by any ripe male. Thus frogs pair and part; and though the croaking of the males, to which the females may weakly respond, is a sex-signal, there is no individual reference. Any female for any male is the rule. The same promiscuity is illustrated by many of the gregarious lizards, by such birds as ruffs and cow-birds, by such mammals as hares and bats. The distinctive feature is not merely that a male has to do with several females, or that a female has to do with several males, for that would be true in permanently established polygyny or polyandry, the point is rather that there is pairing without mating. There is no lasting association of the sexes, such as must be allowed for a sea-lion's harem; there is little more or no more than a transient sex-encounter. But in all these

affairs one grade merges with another, without any hard-and-fast lines. The roving March hare has no doubt a psychological side to his passion, and a light-o'-love lizard may linger beside its mate after the physiological storm has passed. Very gradually there is an ascent to mating (as distinguished from pairing), to what we may venture to call a kind of marriage, which lasts for a season or for life.

In many birds, where æsthetic courtship reaches a high level, with correlated emotion overflowing, the sex-urge is sharply punctuated. There is intimate mating, synergic as well as sympathetic (e.g. in nest-making and nestling-nurture), intense while it lasts, but passing like a storm in spring. The reproductive organs soon begin to dwindle; the supply of reproductive hormones begins to wane; the whole life becomes quieter and more commonplace. Hunger replaces love for the time being; the daily life is mainly concerned with nutrition. Thus, even at a high level, the mating may be seasonal, being automatically dissolved when the sex-urge sinks for the time being into quiescence. Very interesting, again, are the transitional phases, as when a pair with one brood in the year may have a second when disaster overtakes the first. This leads on to the higher level of permanent mating and co-operative comradeship, and there is something wrong with the imagination of the man who sees no suggestiveness in the way in which some birds continue their singing long after the honeymoon is past. In other cases, it must be noted, the cock-bird becomes almost silent before he has his way in pairing.

Permanent mating—the highest level of sex-association—has evolved on polygamous and on monogamous lines, the dichotomy depending on the constitution, on the normal numerical proportions between the sexes, and on the external conditions of life, such as the food-supply. It is very unusual to find polygyny among animals except in conditions which are nutritively easy. As for polyandry, it is so uncommon that we may almost pass it by as a curiosity; it is familiar in the case of the European Cuckoo, where the female bird responds to several males, who, in turn, probably take what chances they can get. The male stickleback, highly sexed, is a polygynist in the sense that he coaxes or coerces one female after another to the weed-nest that he has built, but as each female liber-

ates only a few eggs at a time it is almost certain that she is polyandrous in the sense that she responds to the solicitations of several males and makes brief egg-laying visits to two or three nests. It is perhaps interesting to notice that the polyandrous cuckoo shirks all her parental duties, and that these are paternally discharged in the case of the stickleback. Inquiry should be made to discover whether the occurrence of mothering-fathers is associated with the debility or death of the egg-producing females. Or is it an instance of feminoid males?

Typical polygamy—or, better, polygyny—is well illustrated by the American Ostrich, the Rhea or Nandu, where the cock leads a troop of half-a-dozen or so hens. It is a lasting association, persisting even when troop joins with troop outside the breeding season. The females lay their eggs near the slight depression where the male sits; he retrieves them with his long neck and bill, and broods over them like the most virtuous mother. If he comes near a laid egg before the brooding instinct seizes him, he passes by unimpressed; but once he has begun to incubate, he is all for eggs. He illustrates instinctive monogamy and paternal parental care, and the meaning of the word instinctive (so difficult for intelligent man) may be illumined a little when we notice that the male Rhea is at first much surprised when his offspring emerge from the eggs. He may throw the first one away as a rank intruder, but he soon acts better and mothers them devotedly. The young ones follow their father at first, but the females gradually insinuate themselves. Motherhood will out!

Similar permanent troops, consisting of a male and a harem, occur among the guanacos and vicunas (the wild ancestors of alpacas and llamas), among wild horses and zebras, among kangaroos and macaque monkeys, and so forth. Thus, in a large herd of wild horses, or in a large community of monkeys, there are several permanent polygynous groups, consisting of one male and several females, and at certain seasons there are youngsters forming a transient floating fraction of the family party. It will be understood that another type of community, such as a rookery, may consist of pairs only, associated, of course, with offspring at the proper season; but this is on the monogamous, not on the polygynous, line of evolution.

Here it may be said that it is no part of the naturalist's business to approve or disapprove of polygamy or monogamy among animals, any more than of individualism or co-operation among animals; moral values are anthropomorphic irrelevances. What the naturalist is concerned with is the fact that the various well-established alternatives work well for diverse types and diverse conditions of life. He may also point out that polyandry is an uncommon sex-relation. He may even venture, perhaps, to indicate that monogamy gives promise of evolutionary rewards less likely to be gained by polygamy.

Monogamy implies a lasting faithfulness of sex-association between two mates, but the naturalist is seldom able to take this in strict literalness. Thus, while we may say that solitary monogamy is characteristic of many birds, such as eagles, ravens, cranes, storks, and swans (and the list is a long one), it is not always possible to prove, as has been done in some cases by marking, that a 1930 pair in a particular place includes both the cock and the hen of the 1929 pair. The probability of identity is great in the case of non-gregarious and resident birds; it will be decreased in gregarious and migrant species.

Among wild mammals living in pairs year after year the probability of strict monogamy is strong, and secure demonstration by the recognition of distinctive marks (natural or artificial) has been effected in a few cases. Thus, rhinoceroses and oranges seem to be strictly monogamous. Moreover, the promiscuity of domestic dogs, sometimes as ugly as it is conspicuous, is anything but a sample of Wild Nature, where sex-jealousy often has a very sharp edge. We allow, of course (not as if Nature needed our apology), that an encounter of two ripe animals at the crest of the sex-curve may have natural enough physiological consequences; but there are stringent inhibitions (e.g. of male jealousy and female coyness) even among animals, and man's monogamy is not always so perfect that he can afford to sneer at its looseness among such types as rabbits and sparrows. It is a plain fact of Natural History that in many cases there is a strict lifelong monogamy, loyally respected on both sides; and noteworthy is the further fact that this strict monogamy may occur among troops of chimpanzees and gorilla, within communities of parrots and penguins.

It must not be supposed that animal monogamy is necessarily bound up with the solitary, each-for-himself mode of life among animals. It occurs in socians and solitaires alike.

If we were departing from scientific detachedness and were trying to discover a zoological justification for monogamy, we might bring forward the consideration that monogamy works well for the success of the family—an obviously important test of evolutionary value. But as we looked around we should have to admit that the offspring of the polygamous Black Cock were no less successful than those of the monogamous Red Grouse; and similarly in scores of other cases. In the Animal World the welfare of the family is often satisfactorily secured by other arrangements besides those of monogamy.

Yet, holding to the view that Organic Evolution has valuable suggestions—as an age-long experimental station should have—for man amid the perplexing dilemmas of his civilisation, which he so persistently tries, as Disraeli said, to make synonymous with comfort—we would make a biological plea for monogamy in evolution. The true inwardness of monogamy is deeper than meets the eye. Mating with one other for life means that psychical love has prevailed over physical fondness; psychical chains have been forged which bind the mates together as willing captives to one another. The beating heart of monogamy is the *love* of mates. If this is not central to what the evolution of sex means, we have badly erred in our psychology. Here for man there is encouragement, for the line of integrative evolution is clearly indicated; here in these times, when our traditional human pairings are being so widely criticised and so boldly relaxed, there is a biological warning—Beware of Reversions.

It would be absurd to suggest that man has become such an ethical pauper that he needs to turn for guidance to the beasts and birds of the field. In his own history there are warnings enough of the dangers of letting love sink to lubricity, and signal instances enough of the rewards of sublimating fondness into chivalry. On the other hand, man's sex-instincts are in the main very blunt-pointed and generalised, giving little warning of the *facilis descensus* of retrogressive sex-habits; giving little suggestion of how to rise in love instead of falling. Till recently, a scientific facing of the difficulties involved in

the imperiousness of the sex-urge has been rare, and the double taboo of ignorance and *mauvaise honte* has led to repressions with frequently lamentable consequences. The sophisticated man of to-day often tries to make a scapegoat of his sex-urge, for the strength of which he, more or less ignobly, seeks to make his parents or ancestors responsible, recalling his char-lady, who avowed that she was 'a martyr to the drink.' But this is often a subterfuge to mask emptiness of mind, emaciation of noble impulse, and stupid unpreparedness for the dignified enjoyment of leisure. Yet, admitting that 'sex' is often used as a scapegoat, that there is a strong current of wholesome married life in our midst, can one deny that sex-pathology is rife? Therefore it may be useful to look at Nature's Lesson-Book.

To argue from the dewdrop to the dog is apt to be a materialism, for while there is a chemistry and physics of the living body, organism transcends mechanism. Similarly, to argue from the dog to man is apt to be a biologism, for while man is a mammal, he is much more—a creature of rational discourse, who looks before and after, controls his conduct in reference to general ideas, and builds up outside of himself a social heritage, coming to mean almost as much as his natural inheritance.

Emphasising these saving clauses, we are nevertheless convinced that man, when willing to use science as his torch, has much to gain from a survey of the sub-human world of life. It would be strange if there were nothing of guidance to man in a survey of several hundreds of millions of years during which in Nature's Laboratory there has been unceasing experimentation with life—including sex.

Many of the solutions of the dominance of the sex-urge that have been arrived at among animals are not feasible for mankind. Thus there are some animals, such as green-flies, in which males are absent for many generations, and others, e.g. among wheel-animalcules, in which they have never been seen. In ants and social bees there is a reproductive female caste, and there is an automatic social control of the number of males or drones, and of the tenure of their life. In many insects there is a single reproductive orgy, while at the relatively high level of lampreys and eels both sexes die after spawning. Many types have a sharply punctuated sex-period, and in many birds the waning of

reproductive activity after the breeding season is so thoroughgoing that a discrimination of the sexes throughout more than half the year may be difficult even on dissection. Then there are strange cases like the Phalaropes, where the female does the courting and the male the brooding, or where one and the same animal, like the Hagfish, is first male and then female. In short, there is extraordinary variety in the form of life's trajectory as regard sex-activities, and man's difficulties, in part wrapped up with the practical absence of a sex-season, are often far from being illumined by the animal solution.

On the other hand, when a wide survey is taken of the evolution of sex throughout the Animal Kingdom, an open secret is revealed which is of much significance for man. It is the gradual enhancement of sex attraction by the addition of the psychological to the physiological, and by the addition of finer sympathies and synergies to the sensory attraction. Groos has pointed out that the imperiousness of the sex-urge tends to be so strong that it is in danger of defeating itself; thus the males may be prematurely insistent before the females are ready, and in a few cases the outnumbering lusty males may be fatal to a female, as may be seen in toads and ducks. Hence there is survival value in opposing hindrances to male triumphs. What is from the species point of view the end, namely the continuance of a vigorous race, is the more certainly ensured if sex-success is not too facile. Hence the racial value of female coyness on the one hand, and on the other of all the varied ways in which this is overcome by the appeals and attractions of the males who seek to evoke interest and sympathetic excitement, and often work up their own ardour in so doing. In many birds, well represented by the Great Crested Grebe, there is, as Julian Huxley has so well shown, courtship-ritual which is prolonged for many days before there is any physiological consummation. But when this prolonged courtship is subtle, it forges psychical bonds which last and keep the two birds loyal partners long after the sex-fondness has passed into abeyance. This we take to be the main lesson of the evolution of sex, that fondness should rise into love, and that the earth-covered roots should feed a stem that bears the flowers of the spirit and the seeds of an evolving race.

J. ARTHUR THOMSON.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

Columbus—Lord Balfour, Edward Martyn—Mr Benson's Reminiscences—A Peninsular Journal—Christianity and Miracles—Moses—Sir James Frazer's Plato—'Bapu Gandhi'—'Gold Mohur Time'—Ships and Shipwrecks—Handbooks to Latin and the Stars—Free Trade or Protection?—Soldier—Songs and Slang—'The Tender Realist'—Arabian Poetry—Malaysia—Fiction.

Two volumes, of very different values when compared with each other, but dealing with the same subject, have come to us. '**The Voyages of Christopher Columbus**' (Argonaut Press), being the translation, by Mr Cecil Jane, of the explorer's journal of the first and third voyages and of his letters concerning the first and the fourth, with the account by Andres Bernaldez of the second voyage of Columbus, is, a first-rate contribution to the history of hazardous adventure and world-discovery. Possibly Mr Jane's Introduction is somewhat long; but we are not disposed to decry this attractive volume for that. Here is Columbus with his confidence and weaknesses; the man of vision which sometimes outran the limits, who after all did a very great and brave thing, and then in the end was rewarded with the ingratitude which is too often the world's gift. The courage in that first voyage, especially of the followers of Columbus, who naturally did not share his confidence, was outstanding. Going forth to the uncharted seas, being entirely uncertain as to further supplies of food and water, threatened with every danger that facts and the imagination could bring, theirs was possibly the bravest venture of all time into the dark unknown. That Columbus under his burden often faltered and failed—as his men did—is merely to add sympathy to the narrative. The carelessness of those seamen sometimes was amazing, as when their leader being over-tired—and the strain throughout those voyages was exceptional—he gave the charge of the ship to the helmsman, who thereupon promptly turned in, leaving a boy at the tiller, with the result that it crashed on a rock and was lost. So far as Columbus is concerned, the story of his voyages is honourable on the whole, but the bloody aftermath is an enduring

shamefulness to the Spaniards. Through lust for gold and vanity they mistreated the natives cruelly, while using the cross as their supreme symbol. Columbus's narrative is sane, as were his methods generally, such as that of understating the leagues traversed so that his doubtful subordinates should not discover how far they were journeying from home. Surprisingly, as he confesses, he found no monsters, except for the people of 'Avan,' who were, he believed, born with tails. His last voyage, when he travelled in 'rotten, worm-eaten ships, full of holes,' was an enterprise more desperate even than the last hopeless one of Raleigh, whose king was rotten. Columbus should be the centre-figure of a powerful epic; yet how easily his deeds and character can be mishandled is shown by Herr Jacob Wassermann, whose '**Columbus**' (Secker) fails. It is generally false in sentiment and a loud example of verbal affectations. He begins with a wrong note when in the sub-title he calls Christopher the Quixote of the Seas. No comparison could be less true than that between the Genoese of these adventures and the high-souled Mournful Knight, who was at once the butt and the supreme justification of chivalry through his unfailing courtesy, courage, and unselfishness. The parallel is maintained but strained throughout. The rotten ships are absurdly compared to Rosinante. The friendly Diego Mendez is made his inappropriate Sancho. No, it will not do! Herr Wassermann is never sure of his own creation. At one time Columbus's 'greatness and glory' lie in his 'strong soul'; elsewhere we are told of his 'usual cowardly dread of his fellow-men.' The great may be both powerful and weak, but not as this German Columbus is represented.

Sir Ian Malcolm pays a warm and charming tribute to his friend and Chief, '**Lord Balfour**' (Macmillan), in the brief 'Memory,' which happily supplements the genial personal sketch contributed to our April number by Mr Horace Hutchinson, with whom, however, on one point Sir Ian in passing breaks a lance. Brief and slight as this volume is, it is a revelation of the enormous mass of work done in his lifetime by the sometimes so-called 'indolent' man, under the heavy weight of responsibility long borne by him, and the magnetic personality which

helped to make his efforts successful. Now and then Sir Ian has 'flats' to join that do not quite meet, as over the fatal hesitancy about Tariff Reform which split the Tory party and brought the debacle of 1906; but he gives a new reason for the delay. Balfour was eager to build up firmly the Ententes with Japan and with France, and thought, wisely but as it proved wrongly, that Tariff Reform could afford to wait. It is, however, the personality of the man that he mainly treats; and we enjoy intimate, happy glimpses of Balfour delivering for hours an important pronouncement into a dictaphone without having done whatever was necessary to make the machine effective; of his disregard to danger, as when on his voyage to America he preferred to risk drowning in his night-gown than wear the uncomfortable life-saving dress put out for him; of his witty rencontres with Clemenceau; of his real indifference to fame and his determination that others, his colleagues and lieutenants, should not lose their share of it.

The history of the Irish Revival, which was less political than æsthetic and cultural, has not suffered through any lack of chroniclers; and might easily have been regarded as over-written, were it not for the gaps in the record that for ever are coming to light. Amongst those omissions has been to some extent that of the subject of Mr Denis Gwynn's monograph; that queer, eccentric, strongly-opinionated enthusiast, who combined and backed with money a passion for his Church and for the Arts with an increasingly childish hatred of England. '**Edward Martyn and the Irish Revival**' (Cape), a beautifully produced book, is amusingly frank in its exhibitions of Mr George Moore in the bitterness of his cap-and-bells, of Mr Yeats carefully not avoiding the limelight that was aimed at the Abbey Theatre stage, of Miss Horniman in her frigidities—but Miss Horniman never has had her due for the generous financial support she gave to the movement. Edward Martyn, with Lady Gregory assisting, was the real founder of the modern Irish theatre; and at last he gets fair play. His work in improving the music and artistic embellishments of some Irish chronicles also was valuable, and he had a delightful literary style; but yet one feels the pity that his nature, with all its gifts, should have become so

warped. His bias against women was one sign of his insufficiencies. Had he been other than he was, he might have done lasting good in binding together rather than dividing the sympathies between England and Ireland. He had the opportunity; but he chose the worse part.

Mr E. F. Benson's *Pincushion* proves rather an obstacle at the start of his amusing book, '*As We Were*' (Longmans); but as soon as he has circumvented that relic, he makes good sailing. Few more entertaining volumes of Victorian gossip than this have been penned. He has brought to his task—which also was an enjoyment—a witty, practised pen and an intimate or friendly knowledge of persons whom Mrs Leo Hunter would have given her husband's ears to know. Largely from the fact that his father was the Archbishop of Canterbury, but not only for that reason, he had familiar entrance to many great houses, and gathered therein the gear of many good stories; but once he came to a really awkward pause, when going to a dance in Portman Square he entered the wrong house, to find himself a solitary commoner amongst members of the Royal Family, and in talk with Alexandra, Princess of Wales. The cab had stopped before the wrong door! One is inclined to quote extensively from this treasury of gossip, but how to begin! The very abundance forbids. Here are kings, poets, high ecclesiastical dignitaries, ladies of fashion—accepted and otherwise; with statesmen, novelists, artists—a very legion of those whose names are known, many of them prominent figures of the ever-fascinating Victorian age.

'*The Peninsular Journal of Major-General Sir Benjamin D'Urban* (Longmans) provides a helpful reserve of facts for future historians; the Author, through his training and staff-work as a Quartermaster-General, having enjoyed first-rate opportunities for observing and noting the processes, condition, and hardships of the Army in Spain under Wellington. Many narratives of Peninsular soldiers have been printed, and generally make good reading; but this volume is more of a scientific document; it appeals especially to the experts. It brings out facts which could easily be glossed over in personal stories, such as the hard problems over supplies and transport set to those responsible and the handi-

capping weakness and discordance of our Spanish allies ; but principally it discloses the growth of the ascendancy of Wellington as a great military leader. In the beginning there was chaos, with deep dissatisfaction and want of loyal cohesion amongst his officers—D'Urban at one time being the only one faithful to him—but eventually his genius for war prevailed ; and Napoleon had reason to regret his earlier depreciation of that adversary and his army.

Messrs. Blackie have made an inestimable contribution to the spiritual and intellectual causes which aim at strengthening religious truth in our day, with their 'collective work,' '**The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge.**' Written by twenty-two scholars whose positions of authority are unquestionable—they include the Archbishop of York, Professor Gilbert Murray, Sir Frederick Kenyon, Professor Burkitt, Dr James Moffat of New York, and Professor Rait—the work follows the courses of Christian history from its birth in the time of the Roman Empire to just before the Lateran Treaty, and so far as a diverse team of writers, diverse but without destructive diversities, can do, treats in some measure the main developments of truth and heresy, religious charity, and, alas, cruelty—of which the Inquisition was of course by far the worst example—comprising that history. Almost every one of these writers is forced to protest that in the small space available to him he can merely touch slightly on the subject that is his province ; how much more so then is the reviewer prevented from giving more than a general blessing to this widely comprehensive book. This, anyhow, can be said, that by their frankness and courage in facing the innumerable problems that have made religious faith difficult to many, especially to those who have absorbed, without entirely digesting, the answering claims of Science, the contributors to this volume have strengthened the truth and the spiritual vision of Christ in the world ; and therefore have added to the influence and authority of His Church. But the miracles are stumbling-blocks, unquestionably, to the full acceptance of the Christian faith by many who are naturally devout. They are an element not so fully treated as might have been in the foregoing volume ; yet the overwhelming

interest taken in their historical reality or possibility, and their spiritual implications, is proved by the lengthy bibliography of serious works and articles printed by Mr C. J. Wright in his '**Miracle in History and in Modern Thought**' (Constable), showing that responsible thinkers the world over are concerned with their possible credibility. This is a considerate and a courageous volume. The Author not only examines the Old Testament miracles and those of the New Testament, including, of course, those which belong to the record of Christ, the crux of them all; but makes searching inquiry into those alleged as true by certain spiritualists. He does not go so far as Rome or as Dayton—how ludicrous that juxtaposition of names and credulities appears!—or the more cocksure spiritualists go; though he accepts telepathy as possible, and asserts that the phenomena presented for investigation to psychical research should not be rejected without decent inquiry. While recognising such limitations of faith as was illustrated by Anatole France when he pointed out that only crutches and never a wooden leg were suspended at Lourdes by those who were cured, Mr Wright shows that he is 'on the side of the angels,' and accepts confidently such of the miraculous as is consonant with the full revelation of God in Jesus Christ for this world.

Professor A. S. Wadia has missed his opportunity in '**The Message of Moses**' (Dent), owing to his hesitancy over the miracles associated with the Exodus. The value of his little book is to an extent redeemed by the excellence of the last chapter; but not quite. After showing his doubt of the preposterous incident of the drowning of the Egyptians in an artfully divided Red Sea (those miracles again!), he seems to accept its truth as no mere allegory or piece of folk-lore; and thereby hurts the reality of his study of Moses, who anyhow was probably the greatest man, in the effects of his work, laws, and teachings, to walk this earth. With force, insight, and character he roused the servile Israelites and led them out of their bondage; afterwards he strengthened them in a wilderness of discipline, and thereby imparted to what had been a loosely-connected diversity of pastoral tribes, unity and a pride of nationality. Moses left an abiding impress on the ideals and practices of humanity,

and helped to its ennoblement. Mr Wadia is evidently not aware of Sir Flinders Petrie's discovery, or modification, by which every 'thousand' of the Jews in the Wandering became merely a 'family,' which makes tolerable the numbers of those subsisting on the very scanty resources of the Arabian desert. The versatility, as well as the rich scholarship of Sir James Frazer's mind, receives a further example, and its deserved tribute, with the publication of his fifty-year-old essay on '**The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory**' (Macmillan), written for the examiners when he was competing for a fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1879. It is easy to see now, with this fine example of his work before us, how certainly that young student was the father of the great scholar who has done more than any one else to build a new—his own—branch of science, and has received for his work that most desirable honour, the Order of Merit. This essay is a wonderful piece of work for a youth of twenty-four; and the fact that not in any respect has it been essentially altered is a mark of its thoroughness and excellence. Its readableness is unquestionable. It has authority and confidence.

Mr Justice Piddington, whose work for Law and economic betterment in Australia is not so well known as it might be, has done a real—and rare—service to India and the Empire by publishing his half-crown study of '**Bapu Gandhi**' (Williams and Norgate). This should be read both here and in the East, for it brings to bear on very bitter conditions, angry, exasperating, and violent, a spirit of sympathetic insight and reasonableness which can be only reconstructive and helpful. While he emphasises the necessity to India of the strong continuance of the British Raj, he recognises, also, the exaltedness and purity of Gandhi's purposes, however sadly his idealism has given excuse to crude and vicious agitators who, while professing to follow his teachings, have made them an excuse for evil. Here anyhow is a possible bridge towards that better mutual understanding which must be found if the present impasse, with its consequences in suffering and blood, is to be overcome. It is an entertaining little book, well-informed, and easily available; and it expresses that nobleness of sympathy and equal brotherhood amongst men which is the true

soul of the British Commonwealth. Miss Cornelia Sorabji has written a wise parable—parable rather than play—in '**Gold Mohur Time**' (De la More Press). An old man and his granddaughter in an Indian garden watch year after year the growth, rich blossoming, and seeding of the tree named in the title, and cull from its beauty, stability, and progress a gospel of human charity and an acceptance of the helpfulness of kindly memories. It is so slight, though full of the wisdom of the heart, that to quote from or describe it further would be to overdo.

From the same publishing-house comes a work of an entirely different character. This is essentially practical and proves not only a valuable book of reference in its department of service and utility, but is full of inspiring suggestions for a good browser. '**Ships and Shipping**,' a handbook of popular nautical information, edited by Mr Edwin P. Harnack, should easily be indispensable to those who take interest in the traffic of the seas. While that which follows makes tragic appeal. Proud and thrilling as are Mr Frank H. Shaw's stories of '**Famous Shipwrecks**' (Elkin Matthews and Marrot), they also are inevitably sad, for they tell of the ultimate failure and loss of gallant lives and of ships whose records are chapters of our incomparable sea-history. If blood be the price of Admiralty, 'fore God, we ha' paid in full! In these moving pages we read of the last voyages of vessels of the Navy and the Mercantile Marine with straightforward accounts of the folly and heroism which brought or went with their disastrous ends. Some of the stories are well known; those of the '**Victoria**,' the '**Titanic**,' the '**Lusitania**,' and the '**Birkenhead**,' for instance. Others are less known and therefore the more interesting; such as that of the capsizing of the '**Eurydice**'; dramatically told, and terribly pathetic, hundreds of young lives being extinguished in a snow-squall of four minutes. But fire was the worst enemy; and the wonder is that more of the old wooden ships did not perish through that element. The stories of the losses of the '**Amazon**' and the '**Cospatrick**' are terrible; and the after-sufferings of the survivors of the second ship simply too dreadful for words. The moral of this fine book is 'Support the Lifeboat Fund'; and a good cause too!

We come to three text-books. We have tested by

the simply available methods the new '**Handbook of the Latin Language**' (Dent); which Mr Walter Ripman, with his experience of schools and the Latin texts, has compiled. He has made a courageous experiment; and although the necessary brevities appear sometimes to be almost too compact, and possibly to idle minds elusive, it must be remembered that abbreviations are inevitable in the comprehensive scheme of the book; which contains, in its eight hundred pages, a Dictionary, a Classified Vocabulary, and a Grammar. Here, then, within one cover, are all of its kind that is required by Latin scholars, the young and the mature. The volume is to be recommended. It may denote the beginning of a new departure in text-books. Dr Oswald Thomas, the Viennese Professor of Astronomy and Physics, combines two methods of exposition in his attractive treatise on '**The Heavens and the Universe**' (Allen and Unwin). He begins with the universe as a picture-book; and impresses the reader with the practical means of attaining a sort of comparative measurement, by taking the sun as the size of a cart-wheel and the earth that of a hazel-nut. Such a method has, however, been used by popular astronomers now for several years. Having wooed his readers' attention with such impressive simplicities, he proceeds with the mathematical formulæ, and brings home to the awed mind the immeasurableness of the universe. 'So vast is the universe that light itself, which in a single second could be reflected seven to eight times round the circumference of the earth, must take a hundred times a thousand times a thousand times a thousand years to speed across it.' No words are available adequately to expound the wonders of life as displayed in the starry sky. It outstretches human conceptions and brings earthly vanities down! Our puny ambitions—our empires, our princeliness! How many times has expression been attempted of the super-colossal idea! Taking thought of the mass of problems involved in it, Dr Thomas accepts the conclusion that 'the universe is in fact unbounded, but finite'; and in this question the last convincing word can never be spoken. Economics was not the 'dismal science,' though often its professors made it seem so. It can, however, be fairly termed the Cinderella of the sciences, for many a time its principles have been

abused by politicians with questions to be squared if they could not be begged. A little book by Mr Arnold Golodetz, a business man with no illusions as to the general economic knowledge and commonsense of most other business men. '**Free Trade or Protection?**' (Williams and Norgate) is, therefore, opportune and to the point; for it studies and puts fairly facts and theories which in the ardours of political discussion often are slurred, misrepresented and otherwise misused. Unfortunately, the majority of people prefer to discover their economics as they go along, and to take such ready-made political goods as their Party managers and the scorching newspapers provide, and they are past saving. For those who want the truth, here, anyhow, is some pure economic gospel clearly put.

The Anthology, with Glossary, of '**Songs and Slang of the British Soldier, 1914-1918**' (Eric Partridge), which the publisher in collaboration with Mr John Brophy has compiled and edited, is not merely delightful as a book for browsing through, but is an historical record of a value bound to increase as time brings its forgetfulness. These rimes and nonsense, often hiding feelings which the British soldier was too sensitive or proud to utter, bring back, as little else can do, the anxieties of the War and the inward heroism of our men. It is easy to see how misled were the Germans through these songs, which to their unimaginative ears spelt unwillingness to fight and the promise of defeat; yet were nothing more than an outlet of war-weariness with no yielding of purpose to go through with it. They bring laughter; but even more they bring shadows to the thoughts: and it is well to be reminded of what we went through during those dark years. Lest we forget—the good of it, as well as the evil. In the event of a new edition, for which there should be many repeated calls, the compilers might be glad to know that 'Squarepush' was in use, at least among the garrison artillery, in the 'eighties; that long before the War the Ypres Tower at Rye was pronounced 'Wypers,' and that the nickname 'Buck Taylor' probably came originally from a popular member of Buffalo Bill's first cowboy team of 1887. Some of the descriptions, as that of 'Blighty,' are especially happy, witty and touched with fine feeling.

It is to be regretted that such essays as those contained in Captain L. Wardlaw Miles's volume '**The Tender Realist**' (Henry Holt: New York) are not more often encountered in these days of a frequently untender reality, as from their wise and well-delivered words and the restful spirit of contemplation they inspire, they refresh, as do few books of the present-day. The author takes a sane view of things, and from the circumstance that his study window overlooks an American scene brings unusual aspects to bear for readers here. With all his gentleness he detects the harshness of falsity more speedily than most; and his sharpest thrusts are against 'united piety and stupidity and their foster-child cruelty,' those effects of a narrowness of mind where largeness and charity are called for. His least satisfactory chapter, from our point of view, is that on 'War.' Confessedly, he enjoyed the War, and, as he shows, did not greatly feel its anguish and horror. Had he lived in England, his attitude towards the calamity of those four years would have been different, and he would not so lightly have distributed the blame for its occurrence evenly over the leading participants on both sides. He has overlooked that monstrous power of evil, foul, brutal and wilful, to fight and destroy, which Edmund Spenser called the Blatant Beast and we called Prussia.

It was a happy thought to reprint Sir Charles Lyall's '**Translations of Ancient Arabian Poetry**' (Williams and Norgate) after a lapse of fifty years, for they are sympathetic renderings of some of the verse of life, thrilling and moving even in foreign garb, and reveal much of the thought and circumstance of the Arabs both before and after the Flight of Mohammed. The translator has wisely refrained from using tinkling rimes or other endeavours to Europeanise verse so different in style from our conventions. He uses most frequently as his metre the rhythm employed by Browning in 'Abt Vogler.' But the best way to prove the excellence of these verses is by quoting, and there, through want of space, we are hampered. Love, death and fighting, as always, inspire utterances which invariably move the heart when sincerity imbues a poet's exaltation, as do 'The Lament of Duraid for his brother Abdallah'; a magnificent battle-scene—'Between them they give and

take draughts of the wine of Doom'—and, to some degree, the love-song to an unnamed lady with finger-tips touched with henna. In this the translator has retained something of the original rime, and that, partly, is why we quote it.

'Yea, take thy fill of joy with her what time she yields her love to thee, and let no grieving stop thy breath whereas she turns herself to flee.

Ah, sweet and soft her ways with thee: bethink thee well—the day shall come when some one favoured e'en as thou shall find her just as sweet and free.

And if she swear that absence ne'er shall break her pact of plighted troth—when did rose-tinted finger-tips and binding pledges e'er agree?'

Dr Eric Mjoberg has observant eyes and has put down in **'Forest Life and Adventure in the Malay Archipelago'** (Allen and Unwin) some curious aspects of animal life as seen in Borneo—walking fish, flying snakes and frogs; the cunning of the ant-eater in securing his prey, and the goat-antelope, which only one person, it seems, has set eyes on. The book as a whole is not unamusing, though somewhat scrappy, but the later accounts describing the tea, coffee, tobacco and rubber plantations are as dull as any proverbial Blue-book. It is possible that the author set too difficult a task for his translator, who naturally would wish to preserve the individuality of the original; but to say that tobacco-seeds are 'mixed with water and sown with water-cans,' is a verbal baldness most misleading; while the following account of the tapping of the juice of a rubber-tree is worse than top-heavy: 'The dumb botanical milch-cow had to submit every morning to a few inches of cold steel, to which she responded with copious tears of her tough white blood, but grew resigned in a few hours and healed her wounds.' Anyhow the worst Blue-book does not fall to that depth of 'English as she isn't'!

So attractive is the very brief glimpse of the Japanese stories of Kyokutei Bakin, as given by Mr Adam L. Gowans in his brochure **'Two Wives Exchange Spirits'** (Gowans and Gray), that, like another who shall be nameless, we ask for more. Here we have, in four tiny instalments, something of the fantasy and delicacy, the poetic conception and the colour of Japanese romance; but there is too little of it to judge by. It is merely a

cocktail, we hope, introductory to a more elaborate feast to be spread for the same material by Mr Gowans. It is curious that a writer so discerning as Bakin should have imagined that torchlight would help to reveal coins lost in the night-time under water. So practical, as a rule, with all their romance, are those Japanese! Although Miss Dorothy Bussy, the translator of André Gide's novel '**The Immoralist**' (Knopf), has evidently done her work well, this is not the sort of French novel that can well be put into English. Its theme, atmosphere, suggestion, are so characteristically Gallic and un-English. Even the title suggests a meaning different from that of the similar French original. It is the study of a sensuous dabbler in emotions. Marcel is inquisitive over the vicious and criminal tendencies of others, and in his way, out of his wealth, bribes culprits to display their meanness and weaknesses at his expense. He sees a child begin a thief's career, aids poachers on his own estate to carry out their midnight practices; at the same time as he studies the physical and psychological developments of his own illness, and his wife's. In other words, Marcel is an unpleasant specimen of clever degeneracy; and one wonders why it was thought worth while to translate his doings from the form in which they were more helpfully set. The ambition of the author of '**The One Who is Legion**' (Eric Partridge) to 'orchestrate those inner voices which sometimes speak to us in unison, and so compose a novel,' is possibly more than genius itself could justify; and assuredly Natalie Clifford Barney has not succeeded in her endeavour. Much of this prose is incomprehensible; yet now and then we come across phrases and passages so briefly poetical that we admire and go on hopefully; soon, however, to be lost again in the maze. The book, with its two illustrations as alluring and evasive as the text, seems to treat of some unearthly aspect of the Eternal Triangle—truly eternal in this release—in which the disembodied appear to be oversexed. It is difficult to see why it was written.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in *italics*.]

A.

- Académie Française, 78.
Academy, English and the Need of an, 78-93.
 Acton, Lord, on the Jesuits, 286-287, 293.
 Aldington, Mr., 'Death of a Hero,' allusion to, 102, 104.
 'All Parties Conference,' allusions to Report of, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268-269, 271, 275.
Archduke Franz Ferdinand, The, 29-43.
 Ariosto, allusions to his criticism of contemporary artists in his 'Orlando Furioso,' of 1532..347-349, 359.

B.

- Baker, Dr Ernest, 'History of the English Novel,' vol. iv, 207-208.
 Baker, J. R., 'Sex in Man and Animals,' 369.
 Baldwin, Rt Hon. Stanley, his statesmanship, 185, 187, 189.
 Barbusse, Henri, 'Under Fire,' 94—extract from, 99—writer of the Introduction to 'The Soviet Union and Peace: The Most Important of the Documents issued by the Government of the U.S.S.R. concerning Peace and Disarmament, from 1917-1929,'..331 *et seq.*
 Barnett, L. D., 'The Heart of India,' 164—'Brahma-Knowledge,' 164.

- Barney, Natalie Clifford, 'The One Who is Legion,' 410.
 Beard, Charles A., editor of 'Whither Mankind? A Panorama of Modern Civilisation,' 294, 295, 296, 298, 313.
 Benson, Mr E. F., 'As We Were,' 401.
 Bentham, Jeremy, 28.
 Béraud, M. Henri, allusions to his book, 'Ce que j'ai vu à Moscou,' 335.
 Bergius, Dr, discoverer of the hydro-generation of coal, 47, 48, 49, 54-55, 56.
 Binding, Rudolph, 'A Fatalist at War,' 94—extracts from, 96, 97-98.
 Binyon, Laurence, 'The Flight of the Dragon,' 164—extract from, 175.
 Bismarck on the Jesuits, 287.
 Blanesburgh Committee, Report of, on unemployment insurance, 212-213, 217-218—evidence given before, 224.
 Bloch, allusion to his symphony 'Israel,' 256.
 Blunt, Edward, extract from his dedicatory letter forming the preface of Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander,' 235.
 Boas, Frederick S., LL.D., 'Marlowe and his Circle, A Biographical Survey,' 231, 241.
 Boehn, Mr Max von, 'Modes and Manners: Ornaments,' 206.
 Books, Some Recent, 197-210, 398-410.

- Bowden, Miss Marjorie, 'Tennyson in France,' 208-209.
- Briand, Monsieur, on the United States of Europe, 302.
- British Empire, effect of War upon, 1.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker, D.Litt., 'The Life of Marlowe,' and 'The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage,' 231 and Note—editor of 'The Works of Christopher Marlowe,' 231.
- Brophy, Mr John, part compiler and editor of 'Songs and Slang of the British Soldier, 1914-1918,' 407.
- Brougham, Lord, on the system of 'Trial by Jury,' 21.
- Bullen, Mr A. H., on Marlowe, 241.
- Bury, Dr J. B., the late, 'The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century,' 202-203.
- Bussy, Miss Dorothy, translator of 'The Immoralist,' by André Gide, 410.
- Butler, Dom Cuthbert, of Downside, 'The Vatican Council,' 203.
- Byng, L. Cranmer, joint editor of 'The Wisdom of the East' Series, 164.
- Byng, Viscount, far-reaching effects of his refusal to accept his Ministers' advice, 2.
- C.
- Cadogan, Edward*, 'The Report of the Indian Statutory Commission and its Critics,' 260.
- 'Call, The,' extract from, alluding to the meeting of the British Socialist Party in June 1917, 336-337.
- Call to Efficiency, The, 294-314.
- Cardus, Mr Neville, 'Cricket,' 201-202.
- Chancellor, E. Beresford*, 'The Passing of the Private Palace,' 145.
- Chevalier, Jacques, 'Pascal,' 281, 284.
- Chlumecky, L. von, 'Erzherzog Franz Ferdinands Wirken und Wollen,' 29, 31, 34.
- Chicherin, M., extracts from his writings, 337-339.
- Chidsey, Donald Barr, 'Marlborough. The Portrait of a Conqueror,' 360, 362-363.
- 'Christianity, The History of, in the Light of Modern Knowledge,' 402-403.
- Church Music Society, foundation and aims of, 160.
- Churchill, Rt Hon. Winston, his unsuitability for the Treasury, 305, 306.
- Civil Service, function of the, 309.
- Clemenceau, M., on the necessity of petrol in war, 44.
- Coal, methods of deriving oil from, 46-47, 51—low temperature carbonisation of, 52-53—hydrogenation of, as a factor of national prosperity, 62.
- Cobden, Richard, mission of, 15.
- Cocks, Mr F. Seymour, allusion to his book, 'The Secret Treaties and Understandings,' 340-341.
- Cole, G. D. H., 'The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy,' 294, 295, 306, 313.
- College of St Nicholas, *see* School of English Church Music.
- Colwyn Committee, extract from Report of, on the present Estate Duty, 111-112.
- Commercial Court, creation of the, 17.
- Conservative Party, Position of the, 179-196.
- Conservative Party, review of its activities since 1922, 179-191—its need of an active policy, 191-195—a suggestion for its future policy, 195-196.
- Courtney, Mrs W. L., 'The Making of an Editor,' 200.
- Crew, F. A. E., writer of article on 'Sex,' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' 369.
- Cunningham, 'Sexual Dimorphism,' 375.
- D.
- Dark, Sydney*, 'The Jesuits,' 281.
- Darwin, his theory of preferential mating, 370—his cleavage from Alfred Russel Wallace, 375—his study of barnacles, 388-389.
- Davis, F. Hadland, 'The Persian Mystics,' quotation from, 172.

Death Duties or Life Duties? 108-115.

Debussy, his music compared with that of Delius, 254-255.

Deer, red, habits of, 63-64, 68-69.

Delius, the music of, 254-255.

Denison House Committee on Public Assistance, proposals of, 228.

'D'Urban, Major-General Sir Benjamin, *The Peninsular Journal* of, 401-402.

Devinger, Edwin Erich, 'The Army behind Barbed Wire,' 94—extract from, 103-104.

Dewey, Mr John, on philosophy in relation to life, 170—on the machine, 297.

Dole, The, or Insurance, 211-230.

Dossi, Battista, 349, 350, 352-353.

Dossi, Dosso (or Giovanni), contemporary criticisms of his painting, 349-351—personality of, 351—upbringing of, 352—career of, 353—versatility of, 354—influence of the Venetian School on his art, 355—his qualities as a painter illustrated by some of his works, 355-359.

Dostoevsky, on the Jesuits, 282.

E.

East, The Wisdom of the, 164-178.

Eddington, Professor, allusion to his 'Science, Religion, and Reality,' 166.

Efficiency, The Call to, 294-314.

Eichhoff, J. A. von, allusion to his article in the 'Reichpost,' 39.

Eisenmenger, V., 'Franz Ferdinand,' 29, 31—extract from, 35.

Empire Free Trade, inadequacy of, 6.
'Encyclopædia Britannica' (1929), 'Academies,' 76—'Sex,' 369.

England, The Freedom of, 1-16.

England, payment of war debts by, 6—necessity for protection in, 7-8—barrenness of the country-side of, 10—conditions in, in the age of Queen Anne, 364-366.

English and the Need of an Academy, 76-93.

English language, origins of the, 76-77.

Vol. 255.—No. 506.

Ervine, Mr St John, allusion to his 'Life of Parnell,' 25.

'Evening News, The,' extract from, on the meetings between the British Foreign Secretary and a Soviet Envoy in October 1929, 340.

Evidence, need for simplification of laws of, 18-22.

Evolution of Sex, The, 369-397.

F.

Fausset, Mr, 'The Proving of Psyche,' extract from, 176.

Ferrara, A Painter of, 347-359.

Foster, Mr R. Francis, 'Joyous Pilgrimage,' 209.

Foster, Sir William, editor of 'A New Account of the East Indies,' 205.

Franz Ferdinand, The Archduke, 29-43.

Franz Ferdinand, the Archduke, characteristics of, 31—policy of, 31-32, 34, 37-41—his dislike of Italy, 33-34—his desire to avoid war with Russia, 35, 36.

Frazer, Sir James, 'The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory,' 404.

Freedom of England, The, 1-16.

Fuel, The New Era of Liquid, 44-62.

Fülöp-Miller, René, 'The Power and Secret of the Jesuits,' 281 *et seq.*—'The Mind and Face of Bolshevism,' 282.

G.

Garfield, President, on Free Trade by means of Protection, 16.

Geddes, Patrick, part-author of 'The Evolution of Sex,' 369, 373, 379, 391—'Sex,' 369, 375.

Giles, Lionel, 'The Sayings of Confucius,' 164—'The Sayings of Lao Tsü,' 164—'Musings of a Chinese Mystic,' 164.

Glaeser, Herr, 'Class 1902,' allusion to, 101.

Golodetz, Mr Arnold, 'Free Trade or Protection?' 407.

- Gordon, Douglas*, 'The Question of Stag-Hunting,' 63.
- Gowans, Mr Adam L.*, 'Two Wives Exchange Spirits,' 409-410.
- Graham, J. Ivon*, 'The Action of Hydrogen on Coal,' extract from, 56, 58—'Some Aspects of Hydrogenation,' extract from, 58.
- Graham, Joe*, 'The Stage: Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow,' 315—'An Old Stock-Actor's Memories,' 320.
- Graham, Mr Joe*, 'An Old Stock-Actor's Memories,' 200-201.
- Graves, Robert*, 'Good-bye to All That,' 94—extract from, 105.
- Gray, W. Forbes*, 'Some Forgotten Writings of Walter Scott,' 116.
- Gwynn, Mr Denis*, 'Edward Martyn and the Irish Revival,' 400-401.

H.

- Hakluyt Society*, work of the, 204-205.
- Hamilton, Captain Alexander*, 'A New Account of the East Indies,' (1797), 205.
- Harcourt, Sir William*, introducer of Estate Duty in his Budget of 1894, 108.
- Harnack, Mr Edwin P.*, 'Ships and Shipping,' 405.
- Headlam, Cuthbert*, 'Insurance or the Dole,' 211.
- Heape*, 'Sex Antagonism,' extract from, 379.
- Herd, Mr Harold*, 'The Newspaper of To-morrow,' 207.
- Hergesheimer, Joseph*, 'The Party Dress,' 209-210.
- Heseltine, Mr G. C.*, writer of introduction to 'The Selected Works of Richard Rolle,' 204.
- Higgs, Henry, C.B.*, 'Death Duties or Life Duties?' 108.
- Hindus*, their antagonism to Moslems, 275-277.
- 'History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge, The,' 402-403.
- Hobson, J. A.*, 'Wealth and Life: A Study in Values,' 294, 295, 299, 313-314.

- Hoichbarg, A. G.*, Chief Editor of the Board of Law of the Soviet Republic, 113.
- Holmes, Edmond*, 'The Creed of Buddha,' extract from, 165.
- Holmes, S. J.*, 'Studies in Animal Behaviour,' 369.
- Hoult, Norah*, 'Time, Gentlemen, Time,' 209-210.
- House of Commons*, workings of, 307-309—necessity for reform of, 310.
- House of Lords*, necessity for reform of, 310-311.
- Howard, Eliot*, 'The Study of Bird Behaviour,' 369—'Sex Behaviour of Yellowhammers,' 370, 386-387.
- Hu Shih, Dr*, on the usefulness of machines, 297-298.
- Hunsdon, Lord*, on present-day Estate Duty, 112.
- Huxley, Julian*, 'Essays of a Biologist,' 369—'Courtship of the Crested Grebe,' 370, 397.

I.

- Imperial Conference of 1926*, acts of the, 2-3.
- Indian Statutory Commission and its Critics*, Report of the, 260-280.
- Insurance or the Dole*, 211-230.
- Irving, Sir Henry*, the late, 318-319.

J.

- Jackson, Sir Barry*, 329.
- Jane, Mr Cecil*, translator of 'The Voyages of Christopher Columbus,' 398.
- Japanese House of Peers*, composition of, 133-138—jurisdiction of, 138-140—groups in, 140-142—procedure of, 142-143—proposals for reform of, 144.
- Japanese Second Chamber, The*, 133-144.
- Jespersen, Otto*, 'Growth and Structure of the English Language,' 76, 86, 89—quotation from, 83.
- Jesuits, The*, 281-293.

Jesuits, the teaching of the, 281—contrasted with Calvinists, 282—philosophy of the, 282-283—their work in Europe, 284-285—their opposition to nationalism, 285-287—missionary work of the, 288, 289-290—suppression and reinstatement of the, 291—their relation to modern thought, 292-293.

Jinnah, Mr, 275-276.

Juries, origin of, 22—prejudices of, 24-27.

Jury, The Curse of Trial by, 17-28.

K.

Kapadia, Dr S. A., joint editor of 'The Wisdom of the East' Series, 164.

Kendal, Dame Madge, on Marion Terry, 317-318—her pre-eminence as an actress, 318.

Kirkconnell, Watson, 'The European Heritage. A Synopsis of European Cultural Achievement,' 294, 295, 302-303.

Krauch, Dr Carl, on the catalytic hydrogenation of coal, 50-51, 57.

L.

Laffan, R. G. D., 'The Archduke Franz Ferdinand,' 29.

Lambert, Constant, 259.

Law, reform of the, 311.

Lawrence, C. E., 'Christopher Marlowe, the Man,' 231.

Lawton, Lancelot, 'The New Era of Liquid Fuel,' 44.

Lemaitre, M. Aug., on St Augustine, 282.

Life Duties, arguments in favour of, 109-113.

Life Duties or Death Duties? 108-115.

Life, The Music of, 247-259.

Liquid Fuel, The New Era of, 44-62.

Litigation, Report of Sub-Committee of the London Chamber of Commerce on the expense of 1930..17—extracts from, 18, 21.

Litvinov, M., extracts from his speeches, 343-344, 345-346.

Lloyd, D. B., 'The Call to Efficiency,' 294.

London, tendencies of modern architecture in, 149-150, 155-157.

Lyall, Sir Charles, 'Translations of Ancient Arabian Poetry,' 408-409.

M.

Macphail, Sir Andrew, 'The Freedom of England,' 1.

Macaulay, Lord, allusion to his verbal picture of Marlborough, 367.

McCurdy, Edward, 'A Painter of Ferrara,' 347.

MacDonald, Rt Hon. J. Ramsay, on the resumption of diplomatic relations with Russia, 340-346.

Mahler, the music of, 251-252.

'Malbrook,' 360-368.

Malcolm, Sir Ian, 'Lord Balfour,' 399-400.

Man's Soul in War, 94-107.

Mansfield, Lord, Lord Chief Justice, on trial by jury, 26.

Marlborough, John, Duke of, character of, 360-361, 366-368—military genius of, 361-362—loved by his soldiers, 366.

Marlowe, Christopher, the Man, 231-246.

Marlowe, Christopher, characteristics of his work, 233-236—his inferiority to Shakespeare, 237, 238, 243-244—his limitations, 238—his sense of humour, 241-242—his influence on the mind and work of Shakespeare, 244-245—his friendship with Edmund Spenser, 245-246.

Martin, Mr Everett Dean, on education, 313.

Mason, J. W. T., 'The Creative East,' 164—extract from, 166-167.

Meisenheimer, J., 'Geschlecht und Geschlechter,' 369.

Mendl, R. W. S., 'The Music of Life,' 247.

Merezhkovsky, Dmitri, 'Michael Angelo,' 201.

Miles, Captain L. Wardlaw, 'The Tender Realist,' 408.

Mjoberg, Dr Eric, 'Forest Life and Adventure in the Malay Archipelago,' 409.

Monogamy, desirability of, in evolution, 395.

Montague, C. E., 'Disenchantment,' 94—extract from, 106.

Montefiore, Dr C. G., 'IV Ezra,' 203-204.

Morris Committee, investigations of, into the administration of the Insurance System, 226.

Morrow, Ian F. D., 'Man's Soul in War,' 94.

Moslems, their antagonisms to Hindus, 275-277.

Mozart, the music of, 247-248.

Muir, Ramsay, 'How Britain is Governed. A Critical Analysis of Modern Developments in the British System of Government,' 294, 295, 300, 306, 308, 309.

Mullins, Claud, 'The Curse of Trial by Jury,' 17.

Murray, Dr R. H., editor of 'The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century,' 202-203.

Music of Life, The, 247-259.

Music, The School of English Church, 158-163.

N.

Nehru Report, extract from, on the North West Frontier problem, 269, 270, 276.

Newman, Mr Bertram, 'Lord Melbourne,' 198.

Nicholson, Sydney H., M.V.O., Mus. Doc., 'The School of English Church Music,' 158.

Nicolson, Mr Harold, 'Life of Lord Carnock,' 199-200.

Notovitch, Nicholas, allusion to his 'Unknown Life of Christ,' 164.

O.

Oil, its necessity in peace and war, 44—location of reserves of, 44-45—methods of derivation of, from coal, 46-47—economic factors concerning, 60-62.

Olivero, Professor Federico, 'An Introduction to Hardy,' 208.

Orton, W. A., 'Labour in Transition,' allusion to, 337.

P.

Painter of Ferrara, A, 347-359.

Parliament, reform of, 307, 311.

Partington, Mr Wilfred, editor of 'The Private Letter-Books of Sir Walter Scott,' 197-198.

'Peace, and the Soviet Union,' 331-346.

Pekář, Professor J., 'Irrtümer und Gefahren der Bodenreform,' 30.

Penny Postage, plea for return to, 305-306.

Piddington, Mr Justice, 'Bapu Gandhi,' 404-405.

Popham, Geoffrey, 'The Soviet Union and Peace,' 331.

Position of the Conservative Party, The, 179-196.

Private Palace, Passing of the, 145-157.

Protection, necessity for, in England, 7-8—dangers of, 15-16—the fore-runner of Free Trade, 16.

R.

Redman, H. Vere, 'The Japanese Second Chamber,' 133.

Regan, Dr Tate, on the sex-behaviour of angler-fishes, 388.

Reitz, Colonel Deneyes, 'Commande,' allusion to, 100.

Remarque, Erich Maria, 'All Quiet on the Western Front,' 94, 103—extract from, 96-97.

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission and its Critics, The, 260-280.

Report of the Sub-Committee of the London Chamber of Commerce on the Expense of Litigation, 1930, 17-18.

Rhea, an example of polygamy, 393.

Ripman, Mr Walter, compiler of 'Handbook of the Latin Language,' 405-406.

Robertson, Sir Johnston Forbes, 318-319.

Rolle, Richard, Selected Works of, 204.

Russia, her policy in Persia, 45-46.

S.

- 'Sale-Room, The,' a weekly periodical edited by Sir Walter Scott, founding of, 116-117—format of, 117-118—contributions to, 118 *et seq.*—extracts from, 118-119 *et seq.*
- Sassoon, Siegfried, 'Memoirs of a Fox-Hunting Man,' 94—allusion to, 102-103.
- Sastri, Mr, his objections to federal government for India, 264, 265—his criticism of the Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, 278.
- Saunders, K. J., part author of 'The Buddha's Way of Virtue,' 164—extract from, 167, 168
- Savory, Theodore H., 'The Biology of Spiders,' 369.
- Schönberg, experimental character of his music, 257-258.
- School of English Church Music, The, 158-163.
- School of English Church Music, inauguration of, 160, 161—work of, 162—aims of, 163.
- Scott, Sir Walter, editor of 'The Sale-Room,' a weekly periodical, 116—his contributions to, 116 *et seq.*
- Sex, The Evolution of, 369-397.
- Sex, progress made in the evolution of, 369-372—differentiation of, 372-374—evolution of sex-dimorphism, 374-377, 390-391—contrast between sexual and asexual reproduction, 377-378—metabolic theory of, 378-383—benefit to man of evolution of, in the animal kingdom, 397.
- Sex Research, Programme of the London Congress of the International Society for, 369.
- Shakespeare, the man, as shown by his writings, 231-232.
- Shaw, George Bernard, extract from his preface to 'Pygmalion,' 89.
- Shaw, Mr Frank H., 'Famous Shipwrecks,' 405.
- Sherard, Mr. Odell, 'The Lore of the Unicorn,' 205-206.
- Sibelius, the music of, 255-256.
- Skeat, W. W., 'A Primer of English Etymology,' 76, 91.
- Skinner, D. G., 'The Action of Hydrogen on Coal,' extract from, 56, 58.
- Smuts, General, extract from his preface to Colonel Reitz's book 'Commande,' 100.

Snowden, Rt Hon. Philip, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 300—on increased Estate Duty, 115.

Some Forgotten Writings of Walter Scott, 116-132.

Some Recent Books, 197-210, 398-410.

Sorabji, Miss Cornelia, 'Gold Mohur Time,' 405.

Sosnosky, Theodor von, 'Erzherzog Franz Ferdinand,' 29, 31, 38—quotations from, 33-34, 35-36.

'Soviet Union and Peace, The,' 331-346.

'Soviet Union (the) and Peace: The Most Important of the Documents issued by the Government of the U.S.S.R. concerning Peace and Disarmament, from 1917-1929,' allusions to and extracts from, 331-346.

Spenser, the man, as shown by his writings, 232.

Spiders, sexual behaviour of, 384-385.

Stag-Hunting, The Question of, 63-75.

Stage, The: Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow, 315-330.

Stanojevic, S., 'Die Ermordung des Erzherzogs Franz Ferdinand,' 29.

Steel, Mrs Flora Annie, 'The Garden of Fidelity,' 188-189.

Stevens, Mr Henry, editor and publisher of 'New Light on the Discovery of Australia,' 205.

Strauss, Richard, the music of, 252-254.

Stravinsky, the music of, 256-257.

Sullivan, Mr J. W. N., allusion to his article 'Science and Religion,' in the 'Observer,' 166.

T.

Terry, Miss Marion, the late, 316, 317-318.

Theatre, reforms necessary for the success of the, 330.

The Japanese Second Chamber, 133-144.

The Jesuits, 281-293.

The Passing of the Private Palace, 144-157.

The Question of Stag-Hunting, 63-75.

- The Stage: Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow,** 315-330.
- Thomas, Dr Oswald,** 'The Heavens and the Universe,' 406.
- Thomson, Professor J. Arthur,** 'The Evolution of Sex,' 369, 379, 391—'Sex,' 369, 375.
- 'Times, The,'** extract from, concerning resumption of Anglo-Soviet diplomatic relations, 331—extract from, on the Soviet War against China, 342—extract from, on the Soviet Army, 344.
- Trevelyan, Sir Charles,** extract from his Preface to Mr F. Seymour Cocks' book, 'The Secret Treaties and Understandings,' 340-341.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, O.M.,** 'England under Queen Anne: Blenheim,' 360, 362, 363-364, 365—extracts from, 364, 367, 368.
- Trial by Jury, The Curse of,** 17-28.
- U.
- Unemployment Insurance,** failure of system of, in this country, 211—Blanesburgh Committee's views on, 212-214—suggestions for dealing with, 221 *et seq.*
- Urwick, Mr E. J.,** 'The Message of Plato,' extract from, 169.
- W.
- Wadia, Professor A. S.,** 'The Message of Moses,' 403-404.
- Wagiswara, W.,** part author of 'The Buddha's Way of Virtue,' 164—extract from, 167.
- Walton, William,** 259.
- War, Man's Soul in,** 94-107.
- Wassermann, Herr Jacob,** 'Columbus,' 399.
- Watson, Professor Seton,** 'Southern Slav Question,' 29.
- Weekley, Ernest,** 'The Romance of Words,' 76, 78, 80, 82.
- Weisse,** quotation from his preface to 'The Future of the English Language,' 86.
- Wellard, J. Howard,** 'English and the Need of an Academy,' 76.
- Wells, Mr H. G.,** 167—extract from his 'Open Conspiracy,' 171.
- Wertheimer, Herr Egon,** 'Portrait of the Labour Party,' 206-207.
- Wheat,** statistics relating to, 10-13.
- Wilson, James,** 'Malbrook,' 360.
- Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé, D.Sc.,** 'The History of British Civilisation,' 295, 297—extracts from, 299-300, 301, 314.
- Wisdom of the East, The,** 164-178.
- Wright, Mr C. J.,** 'Miracle in History and in Modern Thought,' 403.
- Writings of Walter Scott, Some Forgotten,** 116-132.
- Wyld, H. C.,** 'A Short History of English,' 76—extract from, 89.
- Y.
- Yellowhammer, sexual behaviour of the,** 386-387.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH VOLUME.

